

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22 February 1994

The SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

A petition signed by 102 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to phase out intensive animal husbandry practices was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETROL

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to call on the Federal Government to abandon the increase in tax on leaded petrol was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to question No. 59 on the Notice Paper, be distributed and printed in *Hansard* and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

GULF ST VINCENT

In reply to **Mr De LAINE (Price)** 16 February.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: A survey of the Gulf St Vincent prawn stock using industry vessels took place on 7-8 November 1993. On 22 November 1993 SARDI researchers provided the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fisheries Management Committee (GSVPFMC) with a summary of the results. On 3 December 1993 committee members held an informal meeting to discuss a number of issues relating to the fishery. As the meeting was not a formal meeting of the committee no minutes were kept. This meeting explored the criteria that would be required to be met before any fishing could commence. At the meeting it was identified that tightly controlled fishing could be considered. On 17 December 1993 a representative for the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Boat Owner's Association (Mr M. Trenerry on behalf of Mr Valcic) made representation to the Chairman of the GSVPFMC seeking approval for fishing to commence. In response the Chairman consulted with SARDI, Primary Industries South Australia (PISA—Fisheries) and industry by telephone. In response to the advice received, especially concerns expressed by a licence holder Mr M. Corigliano, the committee recommended to restrict the activity to an extended fishing survey (using industry vessels) in the southern region of the Gulf and Investigator Strait to test the extent of the stock in the region under fishing conditions. This recommendation was conveyed to me via the General Manager, Fisheries in PISA. As Minister I endorsed the recommendation and issued a press release accordingly. The extended fishing survey took place on 18-24 December 1993.

EVANS, HON. M.J., RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER: I wish to advise the House that last Friday I received the following letter of resignation from Mr M.J. Evans:

Mr Speaker,

Pursuant to section 30 of the Constitution Act, I hereby tender my resignation as the member for Elizabeth in the House of Assembly.

I am resigning in order to be able to nominate for the by-election now under way for the seat of Bonython in the Commonwealth Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) Martyn Evans
Member for Elizabeth.

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

The SPEAKER: Last Thursday the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in a question without notice asked me to make a ruling about country members' accommodation allowances. In answering the question, let me first make the point that I do not make 'rulings' by answers to questions. There are other procedures available to the House by which that should happen. The substance of the question is obviously important to the House and I make clear that, while the privileges and autonomy of the House are of the highest importance in enabling all members to carry out their duties without fear or favour, we should apply to ourselves the standards we expect of the community we serve.

The Auditor-General will, as part of the audit mandate, audit the financial records of the House. He has advised me that the audit program will include a review of members' allowances including country members' accommodation allowances. If there is any suggestion of wrongdoing, I am sure that the Auditor-General will pursue the matter, and I want to strongly make the point that there is no evidence before me of wrongdoing by any member or former member of the House. I would welcome any comments the Auditor-General might like to make about ensuring better accountability and any recommendations made by him would be seriously examined by the House.

As to the Police Anti-Corruption Branch, it is my belief that they have no part in any investigation into matters involving members of this House and their conduct within this place unless invited to do so by the Presiding Officer. Obviously were the Auditor-General to find evidence of criminal wrongdoing I would have no hesitation in involving the police. Finally, the honourable member asked me to table the Crown Solicitor's opinion given to Mr President. While I have obtained and perused a copy I am not of the opinion that it should be tabled and, in accordance with long-standing practice, I do not intend to do so. I urge members with concerns about the misuse of funds to contact either me or the Auditor-General with those concerns.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Department of Public and Consumer Affairs—Report, 1992-93.

Rules of Court—Magistrates Court Act 1991—Magistrates Court Rules—Affidavits—Solicitors Fees—Various.

Real Property Act—Regulations—Form of Instruments and Certificates of Title.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Privacy Committee of South Australia—Report, 1992-93.

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Fisheries Act—Regulations—Abalone Fisheries—Licence.

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1992-93.

Wilderness Protection Act—Report on Operation of, 1992-93.

By the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—

Country Fire Service—Report, 1992-93.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer confirm that 800 jobs at the State Bank will be lost following corporatisation and does he stand by his commitment given to the Finance Sector Union in October 1993 that a Liberal Government would abide by the principles set down by the former Labor Government to treat bank employees fairly and preserve existing terms and conditions of awards, agreements and staff concessions? Further, will he give an assurance that the hundreds of State Bank officers who are members of the State Superannuation Fund (old scheme) can opt to stay in the scheme after 1 July 1994?

In October last year the former Treasurer wrote to the Finance Sector Union outlining the principles that would apply in respect of staffing conditions and benefits on the corporatisation and sale of the State Bank. In this letter the former Treasurer gave an undertaking that the membership of the State Superannuation Fund (old scheme) would continue for existing State Bank staff with no loss of benefits. The new Treasurer wrote to the union on 26 October 1993 confirming that a Liberal Government would adopt the same principles. I am informed that State Bank officers have now been presented with proposals that would mean that after 30 June this year they would be forced to leave the old State superannuation scheme. Bank employees fear that this may be the first of many commitments to them that the Liberal Government will break.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has asked two questions: the first about 800 jobs being lost. When I first entered the role of Treasurer of this State I was informed that the Government had been briefed on the types of changes that were going to take place within the State Bank, and perhaps he should answer his own question. However, I will not confirm that 800 jobs will be lost. That is not the information that has been provided to me at all. What has been provided to me is a sequence of events that have to take place as a result of the State Bank and the new bank—the Bank of South Australia, as it will be called—tuning up to be one of the best regional banks in this country. That will mean that a lot of changes will take place. A number of 800 has not been given to me, but obviously there will be changes within the bank.

All members should note that at the moment we are seeing a continual rationalisation by all the major banks in Australia. Considerable changes have taken place in those banks over the past two years, the basic reason being that to stay competitive in the marketplace they have changed their operations, they have become more automated in the provision of their services and they have required lower levels of staffing to meet the market need.

That is a process that the Leader of the Opposition would be well aware of: he knows it has been going on. The Commonwealth Bank recently announced it was going to lose some thousands of staff. When the State Bank of Victoria was taken over by the Commonwealth Bank, I think a total of 4 000 or 5 000 jobs suddenly disappeared. We are anxious that we do not have a repeat performance of that in South

Australia. We are absolutely committed to retaining the State Bank under its new name as a viable entity in this State, and we will ensure that that happens. It is important to understand that change has to take place, but my latest advice is that it will not be of the order or magnitude as laid out by the Leader of the Opposition.

Importantly, corporatisation has nothing whatsoever to do with the changes that are taking place in the banking industry. The Leader of the Opposition has drawn the parallel and said, 'Look, the State Bank will lay off 800 staff because of corporatisation.' It has nothing to do with corporatisation and it has nothing to do with 800 jobs, because the figures are not as given by the Leader of the Opposition—they are quite wrong! However, we cannot expect the State Bank to remain as it is; we would expect it to change.

I now turn to the superannuation fund. The movement from the State Bank to the new bank is a process that is under the charge and responsibility of the steering committee, as the Leader of the Opposition would recognise. As part of that process, a number of matters are being discussed with staff: some relate to superannuation, and some relate to how they will transfer their superannuation across to the new scheme. For the vast majority of employees it is a simple matter—the old scheme stops and the money gets paid over into the new scheme. In relation to—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Stop interrupting. The State Government superannuation scheme is a matter of ongoing negotiation. There are some complications which arise when that payment continues under a new banking arrangement with a new bank, as the Leader of the Opposition would recognise. As at 30 June, those members' benefits will be preserved.

MARALINGA

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Will the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs inform the House what progress has been made in the Maralinga clean-up and the involvement of local Aboriginal people?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In answering the question, I acknowledge your interest in this matter, Mr Speaker. As members would know, for a period of 10 years, beginning in 1952, the British Government involved itself in a long-term nuclear experimental program which required the relocation of many Aborigines, and at the present time the British and the Commonwealth Governments are jointly funding a clean-up program in the Maralinga area. When I became Minister I was disturbed to see that the unfortunate history of ignoring the interests of Aboriginal people in the past seemed again to be displayed by the present Commonwealth Government. It would seem that despite the massive clean up that will be required in the interests of the Maralinga-Tjarutja people—in other words, the Maralinga Aboriginal land-holders—they have not been involved at all in the process. They were the big losers at the time of nuclear testing, and it seems that the Commonwealth Government wishes to make them the big losers again.

I am advised that, on 23 June last year, the Administrator of the Maralinga-Tjarutja people, Mr Archie Barton, indicated to Commonwealth Government officials that the clean-up project could be handled by the Maralinga community and, in particular, the infrastructure part of that clean up. However, he felt that he was being brushed aside. He also mentioned that the people of Eyre Peninsula, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, might be involved in this as employment in this

area, as you would recognise, Mr Speaker, is at a premium—and I agree with Mr Barton's position.

Unfortunately, despite his representations, the Federal Department of Primary Industries and Energy went ahead and advertised the project management, and applications closed in October 1993. This would have presented an opportunity to the Maralinga-Tjarutja people for long-term employment, for training and, indeed, for education, and it is a project that would have gone on for years. So, I was disturbed to learn that they were not fully involved.

I wrote to the Federal Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs asking him to intervene immediately to put the tender process on hold until the Maralinga-Tjarutja people were able to be involved in the process. Unfortunately, I have not yet received a response, despite this process closing some time ago. I am meeting with Mr Archie Barton from Maralinga-Tjarutja tomorrow to see whether this cannot be sorted out, and I intend telephoning the Federal Minister to pursue my concerns. I can assure the Maralinga-Tjarutja people that this Parliament and this Government will not sit by and allow this wonderful opportunity for education, training, employment and the provision of infrastructure on their lands to be ignored.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):

Following the statement by the Treasurer that the number of public sector jobs to be cut will be increased by 900 to 3 900, can the Premier give an undertaking that his promise to increase the number of police by 200 will be maintained? The Liberal Party's policy speech last year included a commitment to increase the number of police by 200. If this undertaking is to be maintained, the number of jobs to be cut elsewhere would need to increase from 3 900 to 4 100.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition still seems to have trouble coping with some of the figures dealt with throughout the whole of last year and, in particular, from where the figure of 3 942 mysteriously appeared.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Last week you were having real troubles. You said that we apparently increased the number by 900 over what we said previously. There is no increase whatsoever. In the 1992 budget, brought down by the Leader of the Opposition's Government—and he was a member of the Cabinet at that time; and shortly afterwards he became Premier—the number of job reductions for the 1992-93 financial year was 942. Then, in April 1993, the then Premier—now Leader of the Opposition—brought down his own economic statement and talked about a further cut of 3 000. If one adds 3 000 to 942, one comes up with 3 942.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can understand why they have now decided to reduce their numbers to single digits, because it would have meant taking off a shoe and sock to be able to count to 10. The Liberal Party did make a commitment to increase by 200 the number of police in service in the community.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We stand by that commitment: we do not retract from it whatsoever. If you want the clear evidence as to why we should not retract from it and, in fact, why our policy both leading up to the election and at present is correct, I point to the simple fact that, under the

former Labor Government, the Police Force itself, at the senior officer level, was highly critical of the way in which they administered the Police Force. In fact, a very substantial report was brought out, and that stated that the Labor Government of South Australia, for a number of years, had been putting officers behind desks and requiring them to carry out administrative roles when they should have been increasing the number of police in active service within the community. That is exactly what our policy does and we are standing by it.

STATE BANK

Mr BECKER (Peake): Will the Treasurer inform the House of the Government's progress in corporatising the State Bank?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Today we had a very successful press conference led by the Premier announcing the new Bank of South Australia and the new logo that will decorate bank offices throughout this State.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Leader of the Opposition says, 'There should have been a ministerial statement.' When he was Premier, the Leader of the Opposition could have used that device on a number of occasions and failed to do so.

The Hon. Dean Brown: Particularly in relation to the old State Bank.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Yes; very much in relation to the State Bank operations. I urge him to check back on his own record in this regard. This answer is meant to be brief but, if I am antagonised, I will make it longer. The corporatisation of the bank is proceeding at a pace; we are working under the previous Government's commitment to have the bank corporatised and in place under the Federal Reserve Bank by 1 July 1994.

The time frame was agreed to by the former Government of this State and the Federal Government, and we are sticking to that time frame. It is important to understand that a number of legal changes have to take place and we have a Bill, which I have given notice of today and which will be debated later in this sitting. Importantly, it is a process of change; it is being carried out by a team of professionals and it is being done with constant consultation between staff and the union movement, as all members recognise. It is a process that—

An honourable member: Are you going to keep your word to them?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I always keep my word. As the former Deputy Leader of the Opposition would understand, we always keep our word. The important part of this process is that, in the next few months, because of the dramatic changes that must take place, it will occupy the time of a lot of people; it is a process which is proceeding smoothly but which has a long way to go; and it will require the cooperation of all staff of the bank as well as the cooperation of the Parliament to ensure that the deadlines that were previously set for this Government are met. On 1 July 1994 we will have a new bank called the Bank of South Australia, and that will be a very strong and viable banking institution.

We have already been given indications that, regarding the way the process is proceeding, the rating agencies are to give it a favourable introduction as a private bank amongst other regional banks. So the corporatisation process is a complicated issue but, I am pleased to say, it is one which is being managed with a great deal of diligence and one in which everybody is cooperating.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier intend that there will be job cuts of the order of 4 142 outside the Police Force in order to enable the 200 police jobs commitment and the net figure of 3 942 to be maintained?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I assure you, Mr Speaker, that the figures I gave just a few moments ago are the figures we are producing: our target is 3 942 and we are still about 1 145 short of that target. I have asked the Chief Executive Officers to step up the program of offering targeted separation packages (TSPs), the reason being—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Don't get too excited. We are still 1 145 short of the target for 30 June this year. I assure the honourable member that we hope to achieve the target of 3 942 targeted separation packages by 30 June.

BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Treasurer inform the House of the timing of any sale of the new Bank of South Australia and of the Government's preferred options for selling it?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: This question is on a number of people's lips, and it has been raised with the Government on a number of occasions. So, to put the record straight, I will explain a little of the process. On 1 July, as I have told the House, we will have a new bank—the Bank of South Australia. Its face and format will continue to change over a period of time, and obviously new technologies will be introduced. The new bank will be brought up to the sort of standard that we believe a regional bank should have, in fact past the standard of the current regional bank, so that it will become one of the strongest banking entities in this country in a regional sense, leaving aside the four major banks.

This is a very important process. It is also important to understand that people who currently bank with the State Bank will be given certain guarantees: their deposits will be guaranteed and preserved, as will their interest payments. The ultimate date for changing that guarantee is 1999, and there will be a transition period in between. The process is designed to make this bank into the strongest banking entity that we can whilst it remains under Government ownership.

It is also important for the purpose of a float, which is our preferred option, that we have a period of time in which to allow the bank to be rated by international agencies. The bank cannot be rated until its performance has been assessed. So, over the next six to nine to 12 months after the creation of the new bank, we will wish to see it performing as strongly as possible so that it achieves the best possible rating and, therefore, the maximum possible price in the marketplace in terms of a float. The preferred option is for a float. There will be a time frame in which to develop and improve the performance of the bank to ensure that the taxpayers get some return from the \$3 150 million that has been squandered by the former Government.

MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier advise the House whether he is satisfied that all Ministers have complied with his end of January deadline regarding their resignation from what he has

called the membership of public companies and the directorships of private companies? Have any Ministers applied for an exemption from this provision, and has the Premier questioned all his Ministers regarding the nature of family trusts in which they have a direct or indirect financial interest to ensure that they have no involvement which could give rise to a conflict of interest?

During the election campaign and subsequently, the Premier said publicly that his Ministers must 'perform or else' and that Ministers must accept standards of conduct higher than those that apply to other MPs or to the community. I understand that the Hon. Chris Sumner in another place has asked for a copy of the new Government's amended code of ministerial conduct to be made available but that so far this has not occurred. An *Advertiser* article written in January by political reporter Catherine Bauer (now Press Secretary) under the headline 'Brown warns his Ministers' states:

South Australia's Cabinet Ministers have until the end of the month to quit membership of publicly listed companies or face action from the Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am not quite sure what the difficulty is in obtaining a copy of the code of conduct for Ministers. I had a press conference during the election campaign and gave it to all the media. I am surprised that, almost 12 weeks after the election, members opposite have not caught up with what went on during the campaign. I know that it took them something like five or six weeks to find out about the State debt blowing out. We know that it took them five or six months to find out about the Grand Prix. We know that the then Premier was not even told about the Grand Prix, Roxby Downs or certain other things, including the State Bank blow-out. I can assure the honourable member that, first, the deadline has been met and, secondly, I will make readily available a copy of the code of conduct for Ministers as was released during the election campaign.

YOUTH ARRESTS

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Can the Minister for Emergency Services give the House any further information about the recent incident at Football Park which was reported to me last week by the parents of the juveniles concerned and which was brought to public attention by the media yesterday—an incident in which two girls under 18 years of age were arrested, allegedly, for drunken behaviour?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Newland for her question. I am aware that at least one of the young ladies concerned is a constituent of the member for Newland. The honourable member contacted me after the incident to discuss the problems as they had been related to her. If, indeed, the events as they were related by the young ladies turn out to be the case, then clearly there is cause for concern. However, I stress that the police have also provided me with a briefing and they have raised additional matters which are being followed up. The matter is being put forward by the parents as a complaint to the Police Complaints Authority and, understandably, it is necessary for that body to undertake its investigation before further information is released. When the results of that investigation by the authority have been completed, the complainants will appropriately be advised of the outcome.

I put on the record of this place that if—and I stress if—the investigation of the authority demonstrates that there was any involvement by police in a manner in which they ought

not be involved in conducting their duties, then those matters will be dealt with appropriately by the Police Commissioner in accordance with normal police disciplinary procedures. I stress that a number of other circumstances have not yet become public, and it is up to the Police Complaints Authority to investigate all matters before it and report appropriately.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Treasurer advise the House of SGIC's net worth and the predominant reason for the 61 per cent increase in the net assets of SGIC in the six months to December 1993?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The position of SGIC's net worth is yet to be reported on. However, I appreciate the question, which I presume is a serious one. We all recognise the damage done to SGIC by the former Government. I do not need to remind the House, but I will, that the State taxpayers had to pay the large sum of \$350 million to bail out SGIC. At the same time, it should be appreciated that the Government was reducing its capital base by taking profits that were quite illusory. So, indeed, its net worth was reduced, depending on which statement you looked at—and, in some quarters, depending on how they were assessed—to as low as \$26 million.

There has been an improvement in SGIC's performance in the previous six months, as the honourable member has indicated, and that should be the case. We will never have a 333 Collins Street again on the books. We will not get involved, as the previous Government did, in areas of reinsurance in the United States and suddenly find that we have a \$45 million bill for Hurricane Andrew. That sort of activity has been called to a halt by this Government. And we are not going to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Well, the former Deputy Premier and Treasurer said that they did it. The Government did it after losses had been sustained. We have given SGIC specific instructions. We will never allow it to sign off some of the deals that were signed off by the Premier of the day. That will not continue whilst I am Treasurer of this State, I can tell the member for Giles quite clearly. We will not have the sort of behaviour that we saw from the former Government. We will ensure that SGIC, as its charter suggests and as defined by the select committee of the Parliament, returns to the core business for which it is a very adequate performer. Its performance will get better, because it will not indulge itself in interstate enterprises or get involved in any activity other than insurance and related business. We will not have SGIC running hospitals or hotels in the future. We will simply ensure that SGIC is the strongest performer it can possibly be, because it will operate in the marketplace for which it was designed and from which it departed under the previous Government.

I not only would expect that SGIC's stronger return for the past six months is indicative of a strengthening in its position because it has got rid of some of the activities that were allowed by the former Government but also I would like to make the point quite clearly that that is the level that will be expected to be sustained under the Liberal Government.

WELFARE ASSISTANCE

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Family and Community Services inform the House about current demands for food and emergency financial assistance being faced by welfare agencies in South Australia and outline strategies being undertaken to alleviate the situation?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I know that the member for Reynell shares with me concern about people living in poverty. At the outset, I want to say how much the amount of work carried out by these people on behalf of the non-government sector is appreciated. Of those, I mention St Vincent de Paul and the Salvation Army, which are two organisations that have been referred to in an article in the *Advertiser* this morning. We already know that this State has suffered badly under the recession of recent years. This Government is working to turn this around to provide employment so that people have an income to support their needs. Income support, referred to in the *Advertiser* this morning, is the responsibility of the Federal Government through social security, including funding to non-government agencies for emergency relief. I intend to raise the question about the adequacy of Federal funding for emergency relief with the Federal Minister and at the forthcoming Community Services Ministerial Council in Perth.

The story in the *Advertiser* this morning stems from a report by a group of university students who looked at increases in demand for materials and food assistance, as well as examining ideas about food banks. The group gathered statistics from some 40 non-government agencies. The State provides emergency financial assistance to individuals and families through the anti-poverty program of the Department for Family and Community Services. State services in this area in government and non-government sectors are providing a range of excellent supports to people in poverty. However, the responsibility, as I said earlier, for income maintenance clearly lies with the Commonwealth, and State services are not there to deal with the fundamental income requirements of people.

However, State services have a strategic role in providing what can be best defined as emergency help and educational services with a preventive approach to keep families from finding themselves back in extreme poverty. I am sure that all members of the House would recognise the need for those services to be provided. But, again, I commend those non-government services that are providing excellent support in this State for people who do find themselves in those unfortunate circumstances.

AYTON REPORT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. Given that last week the Deputy Premier said that he had received the Ayton submission to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the NCA 'from a substantive source as everyone would recognise', does the Minister know the identity of the substantive source referred to by the Deputy Premier who provided the Ayton report to the Attorney-General, the Premier and the Deputy Premier? Can the Minister say whether the Ayton report was received directly or indirectly from a current or past member of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the NCA?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The answer to the honourable member's first question is, no, I do not know the identity of the source. The answer to the second is that the

answer has already been given to the House by the Deputy Premier.

AQUACULTURE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. Has the Government yet made any decision to lift the moratorium on aquaculture in Streaky Bay?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: This is another saga of inaction by the previous Government, and I thank the honourable member for her question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Well, it's not: it is also incompetent, as the honourable member said. I will quote from a letter of 27 October, sent to the then Premier from the Streaky Bay council, which really put this whole matter into context. This saga has been going on since November 1991, when quite a few people had made applications to the council for aquaculture licences. The then Government said that it wanted to get some consultants in to have a look at a management plan. That was done in October 1991 and PPK then started to do that. The letter from the council stated:

All applicants are continually harassing the council about the time delays.

It also stated:

Very little contact or response could be achieved with any of the Government departments.

It is interesting to note the Government departments that were involved. Of course this letter went to the Premier, to the Minister for the Environment and Land Management (Kym Mayes, who is no longer with us); to the Minister for Primary Industries (who told us weekly about how much he was going to foster aquaculture in South Australia; in fact, he put quite a few million dollars into it, but he could not get anything off the ground, and now he has gone). The letter went also to the Minister for Business and Regional Development, who is still here. But this type of nonsense, which went on for quite a period during the last administration, has been brought to a head. We have had a look at it and we have lifted the moratorium.

I have consulted with the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, and the matter is now fixed. Aquaculture licences will be granted in that area, and the State's potential, which is considered to be very good, will be realised. After a two and a half years wait, I do not know how many holding costs these people have incurred or how many jobs we lost in that period, but we are now going to get it going and get South Australia going again.

HOUSING COOPERATIVES

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Is it the intention of the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations to act on the member for Peake's public call for a Statewide inquiry into housing cooperatives?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I did not hear the last part of the question through an interjection behind me. Would the honourable member care to repeat it?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will ask the member to repeat his question. I point out to members that it is contrary to Standing Orders to interject, and they can see the result. I may be forced to take firm action if it continues. The honourable member.

Mr ATKINSON: Is it the intention of the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations to act on the member for Peake's public call for a Statewide investigation into housing cooperatives?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I raised this question last week. The honourable member has not directed his question. In fact, the same question could have been directed to the Premier to reply on behalf of the Minister. I ask you, Sir, to ask the honourable member to direct his question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have had a discussion with the member for Spence in relation to the method he uses to ask questions, and I asked him to modify it earlier today. I intend to pay particular attention, because all members must direct their questions through the Chair to the particular Minister in a clear and precise manner. The honourable Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: They will get a very clear answer, too. The Government is very supportive of the cooperative housing movement. The Opposition may or may not be aware that the Government, through my department, is about to undertake an inquiry into public housing, cooperative housing, and housing generally. The question will be addressed in some detail. The Opposition is perfectly welcome to make representations if members have any concerns in the area. I do not believe that on the surface there are major concerns with the cooperative housing movement and the controls in that movement, but if the honourable member has some concerns I will be very happy to incorporate them in the inquiry.

The Government is very confident that the board that manages the organisation is competent to do its job. If it were not, we would be doing something about it. At the moment I am not interested in what the member for Peake says; it is what the Government believes and what I believe, and we believe that the board that is running the cooperative housing movement is competent. If there are any problems, they will be identified in the inquiry. I do not anticipate that the inquiry will reveal anything that is causing any problems in the cooperative housing movement of which we are not already aware.

SELICKS HILL CAVES

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Constituents of mine have asked what action the Minister and the Government are taking to resolve the dispute that has arisen in relation to the implosion of the caves by Southern Quarries at Sellicks Hill.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the member for his question, and I know that this is a matter of interest to other members in the area as well as to the community generally. I have met with the Minister for Mines and Energy in relation to the issue and, at our direction, numerous meetings have now taken place between the officers of the Department of Mines and Energy and the Department of the Environment and Natural Resources. Those two departments engaged two independent experts to undertake a review of the situation, and a final report has now been received. Consideration is being given to that report and further information is now being sought.

In reviewing the situation, the Government is adopting a whole of Government approach and taking into account environmental, economic and ecotourism considerations.

Taking all relevant considerations into account, a decision will be made by this Government in the next few weeks.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs explain to the House the basis for his widely reported comments that a worker injured playing a game of squash while on his or her way home from work can claim compensation under the existing WorkCover legislation?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: That is a very good question from the member for Ross Smith. I recall a member of this House being told by the previous Minister that there was no roting in this area of journey accidents. So, I thought I would ask WorkCover, as I know the member opposite would have done, because I know that, with his history in the union movement, the honourable member is renowned as a person who occasionally checks the facts. So, I thought I might run out a few of the stories that the honourable member might know about.

I point out to the House that these are not decisions or stories that relate to WorkCover itself; they are decisions of the Supreme Court and the Workers Compensation Appeal Tribunal. They are the decisions of judges in respect of journey accidents. I will refer to a number of the decisions, the first of which relates to a gentleman who was to attend a TAFE course in Adelaide. He lived in Mount Gambier. On the afternoon prior to the course he came to Adelaide and stayed with a relative. He went to the shop to buy a loaf of bread and was injured on the way back to the relative's house. The appeal tribunal considered the matter and decided that his journey had not ceased until he had attended the TAFE course. What an amazing situation. Let us look at another one, to put journey accidents into context, which involves a worker who drove his car—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If the member for Ross Smith had taken the time to check his facts, he would have found a few more.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister is showing great disrespect to the Chair. At no time has the Minister addressed the Chair. I find it offensive, and I am sure you do, Sir.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, but I see nothing amusing in the amount of disrespect that has been shown to you, and I urge you to remind members opposite, particularly the Minister, that he must address the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! In response to the point of order, the Minister should address the Chair. He should not turn his back on the Chair, and I suggest that that applies equally to all members.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I will give the member for Ross Smith the references later. In a general instruction to WorkCover, I said the other day that, if he wanted any detail where he could use the facts, he could have them. I will also give him a couple of others.

This was a decision of the Workers Compensation Appeal Tribunal. A worker drove his car out of his residence, stopped and went to shut the gate. While doing this his dog escaped and ran off down the street. The worker was injured while chasing the dog. The tribunal decided that the injury was

compensatable as the journey had commenced. What an amazing decision!

The next one, which was also from the appeal tribunal, involved a decision by a judge. The worker resided at Port Augusta and worked at Moomba, 670 kilometres away. The worker was a passenger in a car driving to Moomba. The car was on a 200 kilometre diversion when it overturned and injured the worker. The tribunal decided that the worker was covered as the tribunal considered the deviation in the circumstances was not substantial or materially increased the risk of injury. What an amazing set-up! These are the sorts of issues that relate to journeys.

Let us turn now to free time accidents, which I talked about the other day. A worker was employed as a director of nursing at a nursing home. On the weekend, at a friend's house, she fell from a tree while picking apricots for the nursing home's annual Christmas party. The decision was that she was covered because there was a direct relationship between her employment and the collection of apricots. What an amazing set-up!

These are the rorts we are talking about. The previous Government and the previous Minister said there were no rorts at all in this journey or free time accident area. We intend to clean up this whole area of roting so that those who are genuinely injured at work can obtain the compensation that they deserve.

WOOD LOT

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Can the Minister for Infrastructure inform the House of the progress being made on a trial wood lot of hardwood trees making use of reclaimed water from the Bolivar Treatment Works on the northern Adelaide plains?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This policy initiative put in place in 1990 was obviously a result of the Liberal Party's election promise of 1989 to put in place wood lotting at Bolivar, and it was not until the policy initiative was put down by the Liberal Party in this State that the then Labor Government decided to pick it up. It was a good policy initiative because it has borne some good prospects for the future.

A 14 hectare wood lot was established on the northern Adelaide Plains in 1990. Some 30 000 native trees were planted. Clearly, the aim was to determine the potential for using reclaimed water, and six scientific and monitoring programs were set down for that trial period. Following the first three years of operation, the CSIRO conducted an independent scientific audit and recommended that the trial should continue for another three years, which it will now do. Also, alliances have been formed with the wood and wood product industries to assess the likely financial returns, and there is private sector involvement in this study.

Registrations of interest were called for late last year to attract future sponsorship from the private sector, and to date two formal registrations have been received. In fact, the trial has established a link with other authorities, for example, with the Centre for Ground Water Studies and with the MFP Development Corporation, which proposes to send samples of the timber grown at trial to Japan to try to attract overseas investment.

The future of the project is that there are funding commitments for the next three years. The knowledge gained from the trial will be useful for future strategies, including the provision of water for the Virginia triangle, which is a project of the MFP, the diversion of 50 megalitres of water from Gulf

St Vincent to the northern Adelaide plains for horticulture and floriculture production and export market potential. Early indications are that the plantation of 4 000 hectares would be required on land-based disposal of the reclaimed waste water from the Bolivar Sewerage Treatment Plant.

The trial thus far has shown good prospect. There are private sector registrations of interest in the project. It has export market potential, and that is why the Government is intent on pursuing this objective—because it has prospects for South Australia—and eventually we will have an area planted 285 times greater than currently is the case in the northern Adelaide plains area.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Treasurer confirm whether he has received advice from Treasury that the sale of the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, in the absence of Commonwealth taxation compensation, will return around \$100 million less than PASA's future income stream, and will the Treasurer give an undertaking not to sell PASA unless the sale value exceeds the present value of the Pipelines Authority of South Australia's future income stream?

At last year's Premiers Conference the Commonwealth Government stopped the practice of providing tax compensation to State Governments for privatisation. As a consequence, a detailed paper prepared by Treasury, which has been provided to the Treasurer, points out that in the absence of Commonwealth tax compensation the sale of the Pipelines Authority will return around \$100 million less than the revenue stream the Pipelines Authority of South Australia is worth to the State and Treasury. As a consequence, Treasury has advised against proceeding with the sale of the Pipelines Authority in the absence of Commonwealth tax compensation.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It is an important question as to what we will return from the sale of assets. I would make the point that, if we can convince the Commonwealth Government otherwise and in fact change its mind, this will produce additional revenue streams for the Government, and nobody could deny that. We will be pursuing that matter. I know that the Queensland—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Just settle down. If the member for Giles wants to ask a question, he can do so at the appropriate time.

An honourable member: He's very disorderly!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: He is very disorderly. He may still think he is the Minister of Mineral Resources, but things have changed, and I draw that to his attention. As far as taxation compensation is concerned, there are certain members of the Treasury bureaucracy in Canberra who believe that taxation compensation should not be provided to the States for the sale of assets. However, there is mounting pressure from all States and, indeed, from other principals within the Federal Government to have that position reviewed. That issue is still fluid; it will be revisited. I know some further work will be done on that issue between the States and the Federal Government over the ensuing six or 12 months—however long it takes—because there is a strong economic argument that taxation compensation should be provided on the sale of these assets.

In relation to PASA, I received a Treasury briefing paper when I was first appointed Treasurer of this Government. It

said that PASA should not be sold off because it would not compensate for the present value of future returns from the PASA pipeline. Obviously, that matter has changed quite dramatically given that we are now dealing with a whole new set of figures and circumstances where we will dramatically increase the revenue streams of PASA deliberately and by judicious management. The return that we expect to get from PASA will more than compensate for the previous calculations.

PATAWALONGA

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I direct my question to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. What progress has been achieved in implementing a strategy to reduce pollution in the Patawalonga catchment? When the Minister met with the representatives of the 11 councils in the Patawalonga catchment on 20 January, he said that he would, first, establish a register of community interest and, secondly, instruct the Environment Protection Authority to give the Glenelg council advice about options to minimise the impact of flushing the Patawalonga in the short term.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am sure that the member for Mitchell is as aware as I am of the enormous amount of community support at the present time for the clean up of the Patawalonga. I am very keen to be able to encourage that community interest, because at the end of the day the initiatives being promoted by the Government and local government will be a success only with strong broad-based community support.

In order to ensure that we have captured all of the ideas coming from the community, I have established a register of community interest within the Water Resources group of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, and at this stage we have received over 80 suggestions from the community and from business in relation to how the Patawalonga can be cleaned up. That information will be utilised by State and local government in finding a permanent solution to the clean up of the Patawalonga.

In cleaning up the Patawalonga we need to look at short-term and long-term options. The flushing is having a severe impact on local businesses within the Glenelg council area. As a result of that I have instructed the Environment Protection Authority to provide urgent advice to the Glenelg council about the options available to minimise the impact of flushing the Patawalonga in the short term. The EPA has now provided advice to the Glenelg council on the option of flushing the Patawalonga at night. That would reduce the impact of flushing during the day and thus lessen the impact on beach goers and, hence, on local businesses. At the same time, we are putting in place a plan of action to ensure that a permanent solution is found.

I advise the member for Mitchell—and I know of his interest and the interest of his council in this area—that the Government is anxious to find permanent solutions to the clean up of the Patawalonga, and we are well under way in determining the most appropriate action to be taken.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister for Family and Community Services act on the member for Peake's public call for an independent inquiry into 63 cases of allegedly false reporting of child sex abuse involving his department and, if not, will he order an independent inquiry

into the well-established false reporting by his department against Mr Bruce Yates of Lockleys?

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that he made a number of comments for which he did not seek leave.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am aware of the matter that the member for Peake raised in this House last week. The honourable member has discussed this issue with me on a number of occasions previously, and it is under consideration. As the member for Spence would be aware, the case to which he has referred, that of Mr Yates, has been through the court, and it is my intention—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes, and I recognise the member for Spence's concern, and I share that concern. I do intend to do something about it. The department, with my involvement, is currently determining the most appropriate method of independent review into that case and other cases that have been referred to in this House.

ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): My question is directed to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. What action has the Government taken to ensure that traditional Aboriginal communities are fully involved in the process of developing the State, and what is the current view of these Aboriginal communities in relation to economic development?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the honourable member for his very important question in relation to the future economic development of the State and, in particular, the Aboriginal involvement in that matter. He is quite right: the new Government is focusing very much on economic development in this State, and we are laying the foundation for recovery and a significant period of growth. I assure the House that this approach is wholly consistent with the aims and goals of Aboriginal communities.

When I was the shadow Minister for Aboriginal Affairs I visited nearly every Aboriginal community and I asked what we might do as a Government. Almost routinely the answer was, 'Give us jobs.' Those communities had exactly the same desires as members of other communities. They identified to me that if we give them jobs they get self esteem and economic independence and they are able then to purchase better education, better housing, better health care for their children and so on. So, their needs and desires are exactly the same as those of other communities.

Last week it was my privilege to meet with the recently elected ATSIC Aboriginal Regional Councils and the Zone Council for South Australia, which as the House would be aware is a meeting of some of South Australia's foremost Aboriginal leaders. I was very encouraged to hear that questions and discussions focused on economic development, including a person from the north-west who wanted support in establishing business enterprises, people from the West Coast who wanted help to get fishing licences, and people in the mid-north who wanted to develop Aboriginal tourism. So, there is a growing awareness amongst Aboriginal communities that economic growth and self-determination is the way in which they can produce better results for their communities.

It is my view that Aboriginal community life will be strengthened by economic independence, as a self-sufficient community can better look after sites, cultural heritage, artworks and so on. I assure the House that the Government,

in its role and its goal of increasing South Australia's economic prosperity, is fully cognisant of the fact that Aboriginal communities wish to be involved in this. In fact, they are leading the charge, and we will help them do so. I am sure that Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities will benefit.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances. The honourable member for Ross Smith.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Thank you, Mr Speaker; I would appreciate it if the member for Bragg would stay. I want to direct the attention of the House to how quickly a Government can go feral. I would never have believed that a Government elected with such an overwhelming victory as that of 11 December last year could go feral so quickly. I still remember the words of the Premier on election night: in claiming victory, he said that he would govern for all the people of South Australia, that he would not abuse the mandate and that he would not forsake the trust of the South Australian people. It took only a matter of days, at best a matter of weeks, for the Government to go feral and start breaking its election promises.

The Deputy Premier today in Question Time basically refused to answer the question put to him by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to State Bank employees and their rights under the superannuation pension scheme. For those members who are not familiar with that scheme, I point out that, when the superannuation scheme was changed by the former Labor Government in about 1986 employees who were under the existing superannuation scheme were entitled to remain a member of that scheme if they so desired. They were effectively grandparented in terms of their rights and entitlements.

It is important for members to appreciate that the old superannuation scheme, as I will term it, is a very good one for those public servants who are able to see their time through to retirement. There is not much in the way of vesting rights if you retire prior to the usual retirement date, but it is quite a good scheme with respect to those who see their life's career in the Public Service, and quite a number of people stay in the Public Service from the time when they join at age 15 through to about the age of 60 or 65.

Several hundred State Bank employees will be told that the promises made to them not only by the former Labor Government but specifically by the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition prior to the State election last year will not be kept: their entitlements to remain in the State superannuation scheme are to end on 30 June 1994. They will be compelled to go into two other schemes which, for a number of those individuals, will be considerably less favourable than they currently enjoy. It is a form of retrospective taxation, which I thought members on the other side of the House abhorred. Several hundred State Bank employees have had their lifetime commitment to a super scheme, which they had every expectation of being carried through to their

retirement date, taken away from under them. I pose the following question to members of this House: if this Government sought to introduce, basically, retrospectivity with respect to superannuation for existing members of Parliament, would there not be a revolution?

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: A hearing aid? I have no difficulty if the member for Unley—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr CLARKE: The question of State Bank employees' superannuation raises a very real issue, that is, whether this State Government is prepared to honour its commitment to the rest of the State Public Service and the various statutory authorities. The Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition and other shadow spokespersons who are now Ministers, including the member for Florey in terms of his former position as Secretary of the Police Association, all gave commitments about a whole range of things which they ratted on straight after the election. So much for the pledge that they would look after the interests of all South Australians, or that they would not abuse the mandate or the trust that they have. No; they have decided to do the sort of trick that I expect of employers and their representatives such as the Liberal Party, and that is to rat on their workers.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Before I commence my speech, as I am a very charitable person I would give the member for Ross Smith the wit to have understood what the Deputy Premier said. All I can assume is that in Question Time today he had his hearing aid turned down, because he obviously did not hear, otherwise the House would not have been regaled with five minutes of such nonsense.

In contrast, I would like to address a matter that should be of interest to all members on either side, and that is the absolute shemozzle which currently characterises SABS and SATAC and the entrance of our students to tertiary institutions in South Australia. I, and I am sure every other member in this House, have been inundated with complaints and inquiries concerning tertiary admission. Let me be clear, lest members opposite think I am being partisan and in some way sticking up for a part of the school system: the example I give concerns a female student who lives in Goodwood and who attended Adelaide High School. So the issue is not private school and it is not privilege: it is nothing other than a call for some sort of justice.

The girl, whose name is Melanie, scored final marks of 19.5 in Latin, 19 in maths, 18.5 in chemistry, 18.5 in maths 2 and 18 in physics, with a final mark of 93.5 out of 100, or when converted 65 out of 70. Even though that was a very high score, it denied her entrance into her preferred course by about one mark. The only score of 20 in Latin was awarded 94 per cent, and the girl to whom I am referring got 93 per cent. No other student in the State had anything over 90 per cent, yet this girl still missed out on her preferred course.

One of the interesting things is this new penchant of these wizards and experts who decide the fate of our secondary students to convert scores out of 100 to scores out of 70. For some bizarre reason—and this is one of the things to which I would like to draw the particular attention of this House—if student 'A' gets a score of 20 for three subjects and a score of 14 for two subjects, that adds up to a score of 88 out of 100, and it converts under the current system to 66 out of 70:

if, however, student 'B' gets 19 out of 20 for every one of the five subjects, and that converts to 95 out of 100, on the conversion student 'B' rates 65 out of 70. Student 'A' who got a score of three 20s and two 14s gets into medicine: student 'B' who got a score of 19 for five subjects misses out. I do not understand the system, and I want clearly to put on record that this House has to address some of these issues, because I am sick and tired of Government quangos mucking things up and then hiding behind the fact that they are Government quangos or that the tertiary institutions cannot be touched. The tertiary institutions and the SABS board all come about by will of this Parliament and by funds created by the Commonwealth and, as everybody else, I believe they should be answerable to this Parliament and to the Commonwealth Parliament and that they should lift their game, because quite clearly it is not good enough.

I would also like briefly to address the Fairway scheme, which is the tertiary institutions' wonderful new experiment in social engineering. As I have said in this House many times, I happen to believe in the previous Government's commitment to social justice, but how that is translated into university entrance really boggles the mind. If you happen to live in the country, by definition you are socially disadvantaged so you score some extra points. If you happen to attend certain Government schools, you are somehow regarded as a second rate student and you get extra points because you attended a disadvantaged school. I have never met a disadvantaged school; I have met many disadvantaged students, but a disadvantaged school I have not met, especially since this Government at Commonwealth and State levels has made a major commitment to redressing the imbalance of funding for schools. Last year, I believe, Mansfield Park Primary alone got \$200 000 as part of the social justice grant.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): If the member for Unley has not seen a disadvantaged school, I would like to take him to Smithfield Plains High School, which clearly is a disadvantaged school.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: It amounts to the same thing. Students in the northern suburbs generally are disadvantaged. I raise this issue because this disadvantage is to be extended to the tertiary area given the winding down of courses at the Salisbury campus of the University of South Australia. The argument that is being put is that the Levels and the Salisbury campuses are too close and that, in order to save money, the University of South Australia is winding down the number of courses and faculties available at Salisbury. However, technology and export oriented courses are being moved to the Levels campus, and that is a sensible move.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: It is true. I have spoken to Mike Rann about this. Courses that are technology and export oriented have been moved to the Levels campus, and I have no quarrel with that move: I have a quarrel with the fact that other courses are being moved to Magill and Underdale campuses. This has happened over a couple of years and has been accelerated in the past year to the extent that students—

Mr Brindal: That's wrong.

Ms HURLEY: It is not wrong.

Mr Brindal: I am on the council; I should know.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Ms HURLEY: If the honourable member is on the council and if he does not know of these moves, he has not been listening or attending council meetings. Students from the University of South Australia are coming to me with documented evidence which indicates that in the middle of their course they have been asked to move to Magill and Underdale campuses in order to complete them. They have been informed that after this year those courses will no longer be available at Salisbury campus.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Unley is clearly out of order.

An honourable member: What's your grievance?

Ms HURLEY: My grievance is that the Salisbury campus is being wound down and that members of the council and staff of the University of South Australia have deceived students about this. They have been assured that they will be allowed to continue with their courses, but that is not so.

This is a significant problem for students in the northern suburbs. We have great difficulty encouraging students in the northern suburbs to go on to tertiary education. The need to go to Magill or Underdale campuses to complete their course would obviously be a great disincentive to them. Magill campus is already situated close to the city, and it would be easy for students who attend that campus to travel to the revamped city campus. A great deal of money is being spent out there. New buildings are being erected at Magill, I believe partly to house courses from Salisbury. Residents in the Magill area apparently do not want those buildings.

I suggest that the Magill campus rather than the Salisbury campus should be wound down and that that would not disadvantage students from in or around the eastern suburbs. The Underdale campus serves the south. Students from the north should not be required to travel to the other side of town. Distance and difficulties with transport are significant disincentives for such students to continue their course.

The argument that students from the north can attend the Levels is a specious one, because we are talking about students who want to do teaching, nursing and community welfare courses. Many of the students in the northern suburbs have a particular interest in community welfare because they see all around them the problems of disadvantaged people who need community welfare support. They are keen to do these courses at Salisbury campus, where they feel comfortable because the campus is a local one to which high schools in the area have traditionally fed their students. In particular, the Elizabeth West Adult Re-entry School has encouraged its mature age students to attend the Salisbury campus. Members must understand that many of these people have had a bad experience with education: they feel threatened by educational institutions and they do not want to go out of their local area to attend university. If this occurs, even fewer people from the northern areas will go into tertiary education.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Hanson.

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I have very much appreciated listening to new and not so new members giving their Address in Reply. I have appreciated their enthusiasm, their rhetoric and their obvious deep research; it is refreshing to say the least. However, I must challenge the comments of two speakers: the member for Ross Smith and the member for Playford—the tantalising twosome or, perhaps, the tantalising awesome twosome.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEGGETT: It will be your turn later, brother. Because of the many members on the Government side and beyond (almost two football teams), obviously there is great envy and jealousy amongst the nine members opposite—two members short of a cricket team; they probably need a bowler and a batsman.

We have been told by these two personalities, the member for Playford and the member for Ross Smith, that many members on the Government backbench are marginal one-timers from the class of '93—and 'the class of '93' gets a guernsey on regular occasions—and that after the next election (I quote the member for Playford) we should look in the 'Situations Vacant' column, because we will lose our job. That is a brave statement from a minority splinter group of nine people sitting on the other side. I challenge the member for Playford to be specific. Who in the class of '93 is on shaky ground? I will be here in four years, do not worry about that. Dare I say that the honourable member's comments—

Members interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: I can out-gun you, too. The honourable member's comments are wishful thinking. The member for Ross Smith mumbled something along the same lines, interspersed with his usual load of disorganised, provocative drivel. Obviously, he has well and truly been keeping his head buried in his colouring-in books. If the truth be known, the former member for Ross Smith must have done a somersault in his Adidas track shoes when he saw who his successor was—a union product, a union boy, belligerent and arrogant with it.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: I am talking specifically to him.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEGGETT: He, too, has chipped in with his acidic comments. Four years is a long time in politics, especially for the hapless 10 (now the hapless 9) and particularly for the member for Ross Smith. Let us look briefly—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: I can out-gun you; don't you worry about that, the member for Hart.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr LEGGETT: Let us look at our history, at these seats that were going to go—these marginal seats which the experts said would go. In two elections they said that the member for Mount Gambier would be done. If the member for Ross Smith had had his way, he would have had cement shoes put on him and he would have been thrown into the Blue Lake. But the member for Mount Gambier did not go: God bless him, he is still here to torment the life out of the members of the Opposition for many years to come.

The member for Newland won in 1989 by about 50 votes. According to the Mickey Mouse reasoning of members opposite, she had to go. That member is back with a crushing historic win. Her seat is no longer marginal: she has a massive majority. Members opposite should take a good look at the figures. Remember the former member for Hanson—there are only two of us? He survived, and so will I. He is back, but he was not going to win in the 1970s and the 1980s. Might I say he is looking as fresh as a daisy. Let me say this: if he runs in the Districts of Ross Smith or Playford, look out! Members win and re-win in marginal seats because they work their heart out, and they never forget who put them there—the people. The people put us in.

Members opposite forgot the plot; they forgot who put them in. They were capsized, decimated and electrocuted in the last State election; and they electrocuted South Australia on the way through during the past 11 years. Members opposite should keep reminding members in the marginal seats that we are four year wonders or an endangered species. That will just make us dig in harder and harder. Keep reminding us that we are on shaky ground but, remember, if you can lift up your head from your comic books for one minute, it was the Labor Government that was hit for 10 (or was it 9) on the Richter Scale. Just watch out in four years that it does not happen to members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The member for Hartley.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My grievance today relates to education and the freedom to advertise. I would like to preface my remarks with the statement that I still regard myself as a school teacher and I believe that teaching is a noble profession. That is why it saddens me that I must raise this issue. In fact, I understand too well what the teaching profession has gone through in the 11 years of the previous Labor Government. Contrary to the belief of some members opposite who keep telling us that we do not have a social conscience and that we do not understand the Labor heartland, I am one of those teachers who have spent a lot of his time teaching in the Labor heartland.

Mr Brindal: There is no Labor heartland any more.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): Order!

Mr SCALZI: I can say that I thoroughly enjoyed teaching in those areas, namely, Ingle Farm, Valley View and my last school, Paralowie. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Principal of Paralowie for giving me a send-off from my teaching career. I appreciate the fact that, when I went back on the last day of school, they actually acknowledged the work that I had done as a teacher.

Mr Brindal: Perhaps they knew you were going to be a member of the incoming Government. Might that have had something to do with it?

Mr SCALZI: No; they were genuine, and I appreciate that. I would also like to inform the House that I am a loyal and active member of SAIT. Contrary to the belief, again, of some members opposite, the Labor Party does not have a monopoly over union members. As we can see, many of us on this side of the House belong to unions. However, that is only one aspect of the human condition. My identity, and I am sure the identity of many members, is not solely related to my contribution to the production process. In other words, I do not view the world from the spoke of the production wheel. That is an aspect of my life, but my identity is based on other matters as well—as a father, a neighbour, and so on. But members opposite seem to concentrate on this ‘us and them’ mentality, this worker and employer mentality. Those days are gone; they are no longer applicable. We need cooperation between employers and employees.

Mr Clarke: Is that why your Government complies with the unions?

Mr SCALZI: No, that is not the case, and you know that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith will come to order.

Mr SCALZI: I support and encourage employees of all backgrounds to belong to trade unions, but on a voluntary basis, because then they will appreciate it, as I have. In fact, I am a member of SAIT, and I will continue to be a member.

I will continue to renew my registration as a teacher because, as I said, it is a noble profession, it is a caring profession. I want to do my best to represent those teachers, because I understand them. As a PAT teacher under the previous Government, I understand the hardships that many of my fellow teachers had to go through.

The grievance that I have is that, once the last election was announced, I inquired whether I could advertise within my own union so that my fellow teachers could be made aware that I, as a teacher, would be standing for a position in Parliament (and, as polls indicated, the Liberal Party would get into office) and that I understood their concerns. I wished to inform them that I wanted to speak for them as I have done in the union and as I will continue to do in this House. To my amazement I was refused this request because the union paper is apolitical. One can imagine how I felt when this apolitical union was funding a \$100 000 apolitical campaign for its own candidate in the Legislative Council.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I ask all members, if they are listed to speak in the debate, to be present in the House.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. There are six members listed for grievance debate. The Chair called six people. If one member is not present, I would suggest that the time for grievances has now expired.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I apologise. Unfortunately the Minister for Education from another place urgently needed my advice on an issue. My grievance is about a Government that cannot make decisions. A disturbing trend has developed early in the life of this Government. Sure, the Government has won with a large majority, and with that majority I would have expected a Government that is decisive and prepared to make tough decisions without due regard to the politics of those decisions. But, no, what we do we have? We have a Government that is clearly showing signs of indecision. We have a Government that is showing signs that it is too scared to make a stand. What we have here is a Government that wants to be all about committees, reviews, consultants—anything that avoids having to make a decision. In the few short months since this Government has been in office it has been setting up committees and reviews like there is no tomorrow.

Let us have a look at just a few of the committees that have been set up; for example, the one involving the deregulation of shopping hours. You would think that no work had been done on this issue. I suggest to the Minister for Industrial Affairs that there is ample evidence and information from all points of view on this issue. All that is needed is a decision from this Government. But, no, what do we have from the Government? We have a committee to look at shopping hours. A nice, soft option from the Government—set up a committee of review! Let us look at the issue of rural debt. We have members of a Government who, when in Opposition, were forever telling the former Government—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell is out of order.

Mr FOLEY: He is somewhat annoying, being on that side of me. With regard to rural debt, the Government, when in Opposition, was continually telling us when we were in Government that we needed to make decisions on rural debt.

So, what do we have when the Liberal Party gets into Government? It sets up a committee of review on rural debt. In fact, in the last Parliament, if my memory serves me correctly, the present Speaker of the House was successful in moving to establish a parliamentary select committee on rural finance. I think you, Mr Acting Speaker, were a member of that committee. That committee deliberated for many months on this issue and made a very fine report on rural finance. Why we now need to have another committee to review rural debt is beyond me. In this area, the former Government itself had a standing committee involving farmers, Government officials and the State Bank to advise it on rural debt, and many Government officers were working in the area of rural finance.

So, the need for a committee of review on rural debt is beyond me. We then have a review on housing and urban development; we have a review into the operations of the Department of Marine and Harbors; a Government review of consumer legislation is under way; and, probably, the one to beat all reviews is the Audit Commission, put in place by the Treasurer. This review, of course, is not an original idea: it is becoming the tool of all conservative Governments; that is, get into office, set up an audit of finances, which will give them a vehicle to break away from—

Mr Clarke: Break their election promises.

Mr FOLEY: Exactly—to break away from their pre-election promises of this Utopia of no tax rises, no more public servants being dismissed, purely asset sales. Clearly, the Treasurer will have to break away from some of those commitments, and he will use the Audit Commission as his vehicle to do that. It will be interesting, given the composition of this Audit Commission, when we look at Professor Cliff Walsh from the Centre of Economic Studies, who is already on the public record as advocating massive Government sell-offs and huge taxation slugs on individual households to reduce the State's debts.

I wonder what this Cabinet will do when it finally gets Professor Walsh's recommendations: will it have the guts to implement his decisions or will it look for a way out? There is no doubt that Cliff Walsh will not be giving easy options to the Government: he will be giving his true feelings on issues such as massive taxation increases and slugs on the individual. So, will the Government have the strength? I doubt it very much. Whilst we on this side of the House may oppose many recommendations of both the Audit Commission and many of these other committees, I offer the Government this challenge: will it have the strength to make these decisions?

It would appear already that it is not prepared to bite the bullet when it comes to decision making. The Government was elected with a large majority, and we on this side of the House must accept that for the next four years—but, at least, make decisions.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): With some trepidation, I move that Mr Foley be appointed to the Economic and Finance Committee in place of Mr M.J. Evans.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1995. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In presenting the first Supply Bill of the Brown Liberal Government, a number of key initiatives will be outlined.

Asset Management Task Force

Prior to the election an undertaking was given to establish an Asset Management Task Force to oversee the sale of State public sector assets. The role and function of the Task Force was to review the management of State assets (particularly in regard to their disposal or sale) and to advise the Treasurer of the appropriate policies, objectives and procedures respecting the management of those assets.

Specifically the Task Force will advise the Treasurer on three major tasks—

- identifying surplus land-related assets and developing a strategy for their disposal which optimises returns, is consistent with urban development objectives and enhances the economic development of the State
- identifying and advising on the issues to be covered in the corporatisation and sale of Government bodies and developing and advising on a strategy for achieving the relevant policy and commercial objectives that the Government expects from this process
- identifying, and recommending action to rectify, deficiencies in the recording of all major assets of Government.

The proposed structure for the corporatisation and sale of Government business enterprises will have the following features—

1. Subject to Cabinet direction, the Treasurer will take responsibility for the corporatisation and sale.
2. The Asset Management Task Force will advise the Treasurer at the strategic level in respect of each corporatisation and sale.

This structure should ensure that the corporatisation and sale procedure is accountable, that it is reviewed and that it remains under Government control.

The owner of the enterprises is the Government and its priorities may be different from those of the body being sold. To take PASA as an example there are issues such as future gas prices, PASA's status as a monopoly distributor, tax compensation from the Commonwealth, PASA's tax treatment once in the Commonwealth tax net and trade practices questions which will need to be addressed. The Government must absolutely control the process.

Asset Management

In 1987 the Public Accounts Committee drew attention to potential major funding problems for replacing the State's ageing infrastructure and for delivery of associated services. The Committee highlighted the need for substantial effort in refining asset replacement estimates and developing funding and service delivery strategies.

As revealed by the 1992 report of the Economic and Finance Committee, agencies and the former Government have paid insufficient heed to the earlier PAC report and there are no refined estimates or strategies in place on this vital matter.

It is also clear that maintenance of major assets in certain areas of the public sector has been inadequate. As a result, the standard of significant numbers of public assets, such as schools, is below levels acceptable to the community.

Several key measures are being implemented as a matter of urgency to redress this situation.

A comprehensive asset management policy which will clearly define the requirements of agencies in managing their assets is being developed and will be released shortly in draft form.

This is the first time such a comprehensive policy has been produced in this State on the management of the State's massive infrastructure and capital asset portfolio. It will be rigorous in demanding standards of excellence in asset management so that we can establish the basic foundations for further economic development and community service delivery.

The key objectives of this document will be—

1. to ensure that capital works programs and asset management practices are closely attuned with Government priorities;
2. to minimise the costs of providing, maintaining and operating capital assets to support service delivery of agreed standards;
3. to set the basis for a new asset management culture in the public sector which is consistent with sound business principles of analytical and rational decision making.

The key themes and principles that will be embodied in this statement of policies and practices are—

- early and rigorous evaluation of all options for meeting a perceived need for additional assets with an emphasis on non-asset based solutions and minimum cost options.
- recognition of private sector provision and operation of infrastructure as a valid alternative to traditional public sector approaches with efficiency and minimum whole of life costs being key criteria for selection from options.
- a need to keep accurate information on assets and produce regular agency and aggregate State estimates of future costs of, and strategies for, maintaining, replacing and otherwise sustaining the State's infrastructure base.
- rigorous analysis and project assessment of the likely contribution of proposed capital works to State priorities.
- agency asset management plans tied to service delivery programs and objectives as well as specific plans for individual major assets.
- minimisation of whole of life asset costs with a need to consider both the recurrent and capital costs of providing and maintaining capital assets in an integrated approach to asset management and "asset budgeting".
- regular assessment of options of maintaining existing assets versus replacing them using a criterion of minimum whole of life costs.
- the need for a public sector corporate culture of best management practice in sustaining and improving the State's infrastructure base for the long term future.
- a need to focus more carefully on monitoring and improving levels of utilisation of assets and to adopt a corporate Government approach to sharing of assets.

- adoption of accrual accounting systems to more accurately reflect the cost of capital assets in program and service delivery costs.

As a further major asset management initiative, the PAC 'exploratory calculations' on asset replacement are to be superseded by a more refined aggregate estimate of the future funding needed to sustain the State's infrastructure.

A critical and closely related aspect of restoring the State's financial well being is to ensure that the provision and operation of infrastructure and the delivery of services to the community at acceptable standards is achieved for the lowest possible cost. This concept extends well beyond the mere provision of roads, pipes and wires infrastructure for urban development to the intensive operating cost areas such as prisons, schools and hospitals.

For several years now the eastern States in particular have been seeking to harness the competitive environment of the private sector to increase efficiencies and ultimately to reduce the costs of services to the community.

It is now critical that this State actively and relentlessly pursues options for ensuring the delivery of quality services at the minimum possible cost. It is imperative that private sector involvement be invited, encouraged and nurtured in the development and operation of new infrastructure items such as schools, prisons, hospitals, water treatment works and so on.

These projects will then become the benchmarks for improving the performance of the rest of the public sector system which is vital to restoring the State's financial health.

Admittedly, the field we are talking about is immensely complex and we need to have our eye firmly on the ball, that is, the identification, development and/or negotiation of the appropriate arrangements for delivery of quality services at least possible cost.

There are some advantages in activities being carried out in the public sector. For example the public sector can borrow at cheaper rates than private sector developers and entrepreneurs and the public interest can be better protected than through formal contractual and regulatory arrangements. The private sector on the other hand almost invariably has a clear lead when it comes to maximising efficiency and minimising operational costs.

What is needed is the careful development and negotiation of the optimum mix of public and private sector involvement that produces infrastructure, facilities and services at the least possible overall cost. This requires sophisticated whole of life cost forecasting and present value analysis to ensure the identification of least cost approaches.

In order to accelerate progress in this area, the Infrastructure and Asset Management Branch of Treasury will be taking a much more pro-active role in the matter of private sector provision and operation of capital facilities with associated service delivery.

Key elements of this role will be—

- establishing forecasts of the whole of life costs of the public sector providing and operating new elements of infrastructure for comparison with private sector proposals;
- rigorously assessing all new capital works proposals at the early concept stages to determine whether private sector involvement might be a plausible option to reduce costs;
- publishing future works programs widely, and specifically encouraging potential private sector providers to register interest and submit proposals;

- providing a core of special expertise to assist agencies in the complex task of negotiating fundamental contractual terms for private sector involvement which ensures quality of facilities and services and achieves cost savings compared with the traditional public sector approach to provision of such programs.

Once key projects are established with private sector involvement they will become the benchmarks and the key to improved performance in the rest of the public sector. Gains will be applied to the restoration of the State's financial health and to achieving improvements in our credit rating which will in turn reduce our costs of capital and further reduce costs of providing community services.

Program Performance Budgeting

Program performance budgeting (PPB) was introduced in the early 1980's in South Australia with the objectives of gathering and analysing information to assist in policy formulation and implementation, program design, planning and administration, budgeting, accountability, and the reallocation of government resources.

It was introduced in a limited way in the 1980-81 budget and until 1982-83 operated in parallel with the traditional line item approach. In 1982-83 the line budgets for several agencies were replaced by program estimates.

Over the next few years all budgets printed in the Estimates of Payments and Receipts were gradually transferred to the program format. By 1987 all agencies were transferred to the Treasury Accounting System which required that budgets and actual expenditure be recorded on a program basis. This was seen as an essential pre-requisite to the effective operation of PPB. The process of program evaluation and review was seen as the final stage of the transition to full PPB.

The purpose of program evaluation is to assess whether programs are needed, are achieving their intended outcomes or can be made to work better. In the longer term, it was expected that evaluation results would enable better decisions to be made on the allocation of resources between agencies, but in the short term it was expected that evaluation would improve public sector management in specific areas and contribute to resource allocation decisions within agencies. To be successful it was seen as essential for program evaluation results to feed into the decision-making process of the Government as part of the budget process and the PPB Estimates Committee process. It was envisaged that PPB would then be actively used by agencies as part of agency planning and would no longer be viewed as a stand-alone activity. However, under the former Government, the evaluation process failed to gain the necessary momentum.

While agencies produced budget documents in the program format, there were in many cases conflicts between the program and organisation structures. This was particularly true in those agencies which delivered a variety of services from individual organisational units. An example of the problem was the work required to apportion the budget for a hospital or a Family and Community Services office across the programs which were delivered from those units.

A survey was recently undertaken of the existing program performance budgeting system. The responses from agencies revealed that program performance budgeting as it is presently used is considered—

- useful for setting explicit program objectives and assessing alternative means of achieving objectives;
- unhelpful for setting priorities;

- of little value in facilitating decisions on the appropriate level of resources to carry out programs; and
- not useful generally as a basis for policy formulation, enforcing accountability or redirection of government effort or resources.

The responses are consistent with a situation in which the budget and program evaluation processes are separate. The lack of a systematic process that links financial planning and budget decision making with the evaluation and review processes of the agencies means that unless the agencies actively pursue their own reviews and evaluations on a program basis, then the PPB exercise is one largely of presentation. At the same time, it is a very time consuming and resource intensive process.

The absence of a systematic link between budget decision-making and the review processes of agencies has also meant that savings targets have been set more often than not without any particular regard to Government priorities except in the broadest sense. There have been across the board cuts to agency allocations rather than close analysis of programs and their effectiveness.

In the future it will be my aim to have Treasury officers working closely with agencies to find ways of achieving the Government's objectives more effectively and at reduced cost. This will require a re-examination of program structures so that they reflect more accurately the objectives which the Government is trying to achieve through a much closer link between the program evaluation process and decisions about resource allocations.

It is important to stress that the primary aim of this process will not be to identify programs which can be eliminated altogether, although there may be some in this category, but to examine the effectiveness with which programs are being delivered, to find better ways of delivering those programs thereby freeing up resources for use elsewhere within the agency in accordance with agreed priorities. By improving their efficiency and effectiveness in this way agencies will be able to contain the extent to which they need to draw on the budget and so assist the Government to achieve its debt reduction target.

Asset sales are an important element of our debt reduction program and can provide the initial impetus which is vital but that impetus will be lost and eventually reversed unless annual deficits are contained. The long-term debt reduction program must be one in which operating agencies seek constantly to find better ways to deliver services and central agencies assist them in that process.

This process is one of striving for world's best practice. First, we must establish appropriate benchmarks against which to measure our current performance and then we must measure ourselves against those benchmarks. Where we fall short of the standards being achieved elsewhere in the world in the delivery of comparable services we must try to establish why and find ways of improving our performance.

The benefits to the wider community are considerable.

In other fields of endeavour, it is the aim which South Australians are setting themselves and it is the appropriate one in the field of Government.

Appropriation

The Bill before the House provides for the appropriation of \$1 800 million to enable the Government to continue to provide public services for the early part of 1994-95. The Appropriation Bill which contains details of the Government's budget proposals is not normally passed until well into

the financial year. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill.

It has been customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills each year. The first Bill has covered expenditure from 1 July until the second Bill is passed. The second Bill has covered the remainder of the period prior to the Appropriation Bill becoming law.

The Government has decided that it would be more sensible and efficient to have only one Supply Bill to cover the entire period from 1 July until assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. This new arrangement will commence with the 1994-95 financial year.

Consequently this Bill provides for the appropriation of \$1 800 million which is \$80 million less than the total of both Supply Bills for last year. It is nevertheless considered to be sufficient to cover the Government's requirements.

Members will recall that a new provision was included in the current Appropriation Act to facilitate appropriation arrangements when agencies are restructured or abolished.

A similar provision (Clause 3, Sub-section 3) has been included in this Bill to cover the Supply period. Its purpose is to ensure that where functions or duties for which Parliament has appropriated funds in the previous financial year are transferred to another agency as a result of restructuring or abolition the funds may be used by the newly responsible agency during the Supply period.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides relevant definitions.

Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of up to \$1 800 million.

Sub-section 2 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

Sub-section 3 is a new provision to ensure that where Parliament has appropriated funds to an agency to enable it to carry out particular functions or duties in the previous financial year and those functions or duties become the responsibility of another agency the funds may be used by the responsible agency during the Supply period in accordance with Parliament's original intentions without further appropriation.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 17 February. Page 145.)

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I congratulate Her Excellency on a very highly distinguished and popular term as Governor of South Australia. Indeed, I had the honour and pleasure of first meeting Her Excellency in 1991 when, as Mayor of my home town of Waikerie, I was delighted to host her visit to our community. I found her to be a particularly charming and learned lady. I will be fortunate to share her company again when she revisits the Riverland this weekend as part of a number of centenary celebrations. I congratulate and admire Her Excellency on the performance of her duties as Governor of this State. I also congratulate the Speaker on his election to the speakership and wish him well for his term ahead.

Standing here proudly as the new member for Chaffey I formally acknowledge and recognise the service to this House, to the State and to the electorate of Chaffey by my predecessor the Hon. Peter Arnold. Peter served this State with distinction and credibility over his parliamentary career spanning nearly 25 years. He was first elected as a member in 1968. However, it was not until 1979, with the election of the Tonkin Government, that Peter took on ministerial responsibility as Minister of Water Resources, Irrigation and

Lands, and some time later as the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

During that time he was responsible for taking New South Wales to court over water allocations. Both Peter and the Tonkin Government were trying to push for a new Murray River waters agreement, but the New South Wales Government initially refused to sign that agreement. After much debate and perseverance, involving the then Premiers Tonkin and Wran, the agreement was eventually signed, and it is now known as the Murray-Darling Basin agreement. This agreement has been the most fundamental to date in South Australia's history of preserving and protecting South Australia's Murray River water supply and quality.

I also understand that the controversial proposal to build a dam at Chowilla was one of the most frustrating issues to be faced by Peter during his long political career. Indeed, I understand that he maintains to this day—more than 20 years since the issue was first raised—that, if a dam was built at an estimated cost of \$68 million at that time, it would have been a disaster for the Riverland's horticultural industries. At the time, however, the majority of the Riverland residents wanted the dam built, and he believed many saw him as a traitor to the electorate. This resulted in Peter's losing the seat of Chaffey in 1970, but he regained it in 1973. His stance on the matter has since proven correct and has since earned him a great deal of respect.

Although I have known Peter for around 20 years, my closer association developed in the early 1980s when Peter was the Minister of Water Resources and I was an inaugural committee member of the Save the Murray campaign. We worked closely together on Murray River issues at a time when South Australia's water quality was extremely poor. In addition, during that time I became his Liberal Party electorate committee Chairman and continued to work closely with him when I was preselected to No. 6 on the Legislative Council team to contest the 1982 State election. During that period, in particular, he was a valuable example of determination and how to stick to one's cause and to achieve a result. From that period, Peter has continued to offer me both personal and political encouragement and advice, for which I am most grateful. I look forward to continuing this history of association and support.

I also pay very special tribute to his wife, Bev, who has been a constant source of support to Peter during his long career. Bev also has built a long and close interest and affinity with my wife and children. Although Peter has officially retired, I know that he continues to maintain an active interest in several current committees and projects. I wish both Peter and Bev a happy retirement from their formal political commitments.

I express my sincere gratitude and thanks to the electorate of Chaffey for affording me the honour and privilege of representing it during this term of Parliament. I acknowledge the responsibility placed on me by the electorate and assure all groups, organisations and individuals of my intention to represent them in the best possible manner and to assist them wherever possible, whatever their political views.

No election victory, either State or by electorate, can happen without a very dedicated and committed team effort. Foremost to me has been the immeasurable support of my wife and family. Over the past 18 months, Elizabeth has not only performed under the candidate's pressure as campaign assistant, wife, mother and business partner, but also as Mayoress of Waikerie for nearly 12 months after I was first

preselected. Those of you whom we have known in the Liberal Party for many years and in the local community know of her capacity and support. My children Simon, Mary and Emma have also withstood demanding times, and their understanding for their ages is something that I trust will benefit them in the years ahead. My parents, although elderly, have also sacrificed much to continue their valued support.

I am also indebted, at electorate level, to my campaign team and particularly to my campaign manager, Bev Nitschke. Our long and late hours together will always be remembered. I also extend my thanks to Trevor Wurst as the State Electorate Committee Chairman. As I have had over 10 years active involvement in the Liberal Party, particularly from 1982 when I was preselected to the Legislative Council team, there are many in the Party to whom I am indebted for their friendship and advice. I mention formal thanks to the Federal member for Wakefield, my cousin Neil Andrew. Chaffey, as part of this Federal electorate, naturally is working in very close cooperation. It has been a cooperation to date that I am sure, irrespective of the family name, would be the envy of many State members.

I also thank the Party administration wing, particularly Joan Young, and also the then parliamentary team. Neighbouring parliamentary members were quick to offer their support, as were shadow Ministers. I recall since June last year organising visits to Chaffey for all but two or three of them. Not only has it updated their knowledge of the electorate but hopefully it has helped make it clear to them that I, on behalf of the electorate, will certainly be pressuring them as required.

This year, 1994, is a very special year for the electorate, as special centenary celebrations commence in the next few weeks. Therefore, it is very appropriate that I relate the area's history to the House. The region's history is unofficially recorded as far back as January 1830, when Captain Charles Sturt is believed to have camped near Renmark during his Murrumbidgee expedition. However, it is some 21 years later that records show white man using the area to make a living, with a pastoral lease being taken out in the Renmark area in 1851.

In 1865, Richard Holland obtained the Bookmark Station lease, which later passed to his stepsons, the Robertsons. In turn, in 1896 they divided the property into the well-known stations of today: Calperum and Chowilla. It was from the Bookmark lease that the Canadian-born Chaffey brothers—George and William—were granted 30 000 acres of land—and I use the old terminology because that is what was used then—to start the first irrigated colony in Australia. On 14 February 1887, the Chaffey brothers, who made their name as the pioneers of irrigation colonies in California, signed an agreement with the then South Australian Government. The brothers agreed to develop 250 000 acres of land from Spring Cart Gully (near Lyrup) to the Victorian border, using the waters of the Murray River for irrigation. Their families and their younger brother Charles joined them, as did many other pioneer families.

Under the agreement with the State Government of the day, one acre of land was granted to the Chaffey family on the basis of every £4 spent on the project. In turn, they sold the land to prospective settlers. However, the project and the Chaffey family seemed doomed to failure, with inexperienced growers having a multitude of problems, coupled with the worst depression in Australia's history in 1892.

In 1893, an Act of Parliament saw the formation of the Renmark Irrigation Trust, with a charter to supply water to

growers, which enabled them to carry on. The trust comprised a board of elected growers and today has become one of the region's most highly respected and responsible bodies. It governed Renmark until local government was established in 1904, and until 1960 it administered the settlement areas.

This year, 1994, is a year of much celebration in the Riverland, as 11 local village settlements will celebrate their respective centenaries. While some villages failed to get off the ground in 1894, others have stood the test of time and have now become very successful. Waikerie is the largest of the settlements celebrating their centenary. Other village settlements are at Lyrup, Murtho, Pyap, New Residence, Kingston-on-Murray, Moorook, Ramco, Holder, Gillen and New Era. Festivities throughout the year will include re-enactments, book launches, reunions, guided tours, riverboat activities, centennial balls and concerts.

As an electorate we are delighted and honoured that Her Excellency Dame Roma will be attending some of these village celebrations, which formally commence this weekend. I stand here very proudly as the new member for Chaffey, representing an electorate that has lived up to its historic reputation in the 1993 election of reflecting a degree of non-conformity and independence. I acknowledge and accept the Chaffey election result in that electors chose to consider the issues and all the alternatives. In fact, it had more formal conservative options than any other electorate, apart from the electorates of Flinders and Colton. This, coupled with a populist independent and an opportunist group aiming to ride into the possible vacuum of a long-serving sitting member and non-resident Democrat and Labor candidates, meant that about 30 per cent of voters who in the 1989 election voted either Labor or Democrat and who changed their vote chose to vote other than a Liberal first preference. Despite this I was extremely pleased with the result.

The electorate reflected its character of being a State electorate with possibly the greatest number of self-employed voters on the roll. In addition, during the campaign I became strongly aware that the electorate was very frustrated with Governments in general because of a feeling of being left out of mainstream Government policy and action—not surprising under the previous Government over the past 11 years.

I can understand their frustration, as many electors found it hard to recall what it was like to be governed by a Liberal Government, as the Liberal Party had been in Government for only three of the past 25 years. Nevertheless, the election campaign in Chaffey was intense. Also, being blessed with an abundance of media—we were saturated compared with many other electorates, with three local papers, two radio stations and one television station servicing the electorate—the media maximised their local options and the issues. Indeed, this was good for the electorate and the media's cash flow and ratings. I trust that this will mean that some individuals and local organisations are now not only more politically aware but, by having a better understanding of the political process, will be more responsible and accountable within their own organisations. Hopefully they will be more prepared and more objective when they seek their requirements of the Government of the day. As I have said, as a Riverlander I am extremely proud to represent the Riverland as the new member for Chaffey.

I feel it is important and appropriate in this address to convey to this House how significant the region is and where it is heading. I would like to do this, first, by describing the electorate and detailing how the area contributes significantly to the State's economy, then by noting the region's future

potential and, finally, by highlighting some of the challenges and issues for the electorate which the electorate, the Government and I will face together and how, in cooperation, those issues and challenges can be dealt with either through our current strategies and policies or through those still to be developed.

Geographically the electorate is readily defined by the Riverland district councils of Paringa in the east, and Renmark, Loxton, Berri, Barmera and Waikerie in the west, being centred very much on the lifeline of the River Murray. The population of around 34 000 is well spread over five of those districts, with about 50 per cent of the residents residing in urban centres and 50 per cent in the rural environs. The population has increased marginally over the past five years, growing slightly more than that in the country areas of South Australia overall.

There is a common perception that the region has a very strong ethnic contingent, yet surprisingly the statistics suggest that the degree of ethnic make-up, technically measured by birth place, is slightly less than the State average. I suspect this reflects the fact that we now have many second and third generations from immigrant parents and that many of those groups have a colourful and forceful impact in our local community. The area's character is indeed strengthened, enriched and visibly influenced by the wide cross-section of cultures including Greek, Italian, German, Turkish, Yugoslavian, Asian and Indian. The other significant population factor for future policies is age, as older people are generally more represented in the Riverland than in other country areas. This reflects the fact that youth are leaving the Riverland for education and/or employment opportunities and that some older people are returning to the Riverland for lifestyle or hobby reasons.

The region's economy is rurally based, the backbone being 23 000 hectares of land under irrigation but supported by more than 200 000 hectares of dry land mallee farming enterprises. The agriculture industry is the major source of employment in the Riverland: two-thirds of the businesses in the region involve agriculture or services to agriculture, so it provides about one-quarter of the region's total employment base. Wholesaling and retailing provide one-fifth of the employment, and manufacturing one-tenth, most of this being in the food and beverage sector.

The horticulture sector is the cornerstone of the local economy not just because of its direct support of employment incomes but because of its interconnections with the rest of the economy. It concerns me greatly that the problem of unemployment has become worse: in the 1980s the level of unemployment was comparable with that in the State as a whole but it has become worse over recent years and, unfortunately, it is even worse for older males. There has also been a decline in the number of job vacancies.

Tourism, centred on the river activities and associated facilities, is also a major facet of the electorate's lifeline. The region attracts about 300 000 visitors each year who stay for some 1 000 000 nights. Nearly 80 per cent of the visitor nights involve tourists from South Australia and just less than 20 per cent involve interstate tourists; international visitors make up only 3 per cent. Tourism in the region contributes an indicative \$60 million to the regional economy, and that is about one-third of the contribution of horticulture. In the tourism area, and in the Riverland in particular, the Berri district council has been faced with frustrating attempts to reopen the well-known Monash playground. The playground, which is nationally recognised, has for years attracted many

thousands of tourists to the region. However, the Berri council was forced to close the facility in 1992 because of indemnity problems with the developer. Since then the community, local councils and tourism bodies have all been attempting to find a solution to the problem, during which time the playground has remained closed. Unfortunately, the previous Labor Government was not able to facilitate the reopening over the past 15 months.

In the lead-up to the State election campaign, the Liberal Party gave an assurance that, when elected to government, it would reopen that facility and in doing so would indemnify the designer and the council against damage claims. The Riverland community has not forgotten that pledge and continues to call for the re-opening of the playground as soon as possible. I am currently working closely with the Minister concerned and the Berri council to ensure that a satisfactory outcome is reached as soon as possible.

I want to put in perspective the very real and significant contribution that the electorate of Chaffey makes to South Australia. I will always counter the myth and the unfair perception that the Riverland is often on its knees or in continuing crisis. Such an impression is misleading and untrue. As the area has an agricultural base and high cost industries, there will always be individuals and industries with problems, but the region is growing visibly in terms of capital investment, development and productivity. The electorate is obviously well-known for its agricultural activities. The gross value of agricultural production approached nearly \$2 200 million in 1992, and that is a significant performance from a population of only 2.4 per cent of the State's total. It represents nearly 13 per cent of the total South Australian agricultural production.

It is worth highlighting the major industries that make that contribution. For example, the grape growing industry produces 33 per cent of the nation's grape crush, producing a gross value of around \$70 million; citrus production accounts for 25 per cent of the agricultural value to the Riverland economy and also has a gross value of nearly \$70 million, accounting for nearly 29 per cent of the nation's citrus; nuts represent 48 per cent of the State's production of more than \$3.4 million; and stone fruit, for example peaches and apricots, has a gross value approaching \$20 million. In addition, there is large scale vegetable production in the form of tomatoes, melons, garlic, onions, potatoes and carrots, and that now represents 10 per cent of the value of agricultural production, contributing in excess of \$20 million of gross value per annum. Not to be overlooked, in the electorate is the dry land production of grains, cereals and livestock, producing around 8 per cent of the State's wheat plantings and having a gross value of \$20 million; wool and livestock contributes more than \$15 million in gross production.

The region's manufacturing sector, although being heavily dependent on and associated with horticultural production, is also a significant contributor to the economy with its valuable output factor of 2.3. Specifically, the food packaging and manufacturing sector includes wine making, citrus processing products, citrus packing, fruit and vegetable processing, and the drying of stone fruit and grapes. This food and beverage sector employs about 75 per cent of the manufacturing employees in the Riverland.

I can readily illustrate this aspect by giving examples of the success of a spectrum of companies that we are proud to have in the Riverland because of their success and their progressive attitudes. At the risk of omitting some deserving companies, I will mention well-known names. Berrivale

Orchards has an annual turnover of greater than \$300 million and has recently announced a \$4 million expenditure program in the Riverland to upgrade its processing factories at Berri. We also have the Berri-Renmano facility, which is the cornerstone of the BRL Hardy Group, as well as the Penfolds facility at Waikerie. With the Berri Estates crushing facility at Berri, they are the two largest grape crushing facilities in the country. We also have Angove's Wines, and I congratulate Mr Tom Angove for his Australian honour award this year. Tom Angove, of course, was recognised as being the father of the modern wine industry in South Australia.

In addition, we have companies such as Golden Choice, Crusta and Nippy's Fruit Juices as well as citrus packing and exporting companies—Waikerie Producers, Rivsam, Vitor, Kangara and Riversun. The region also has a number of engineering companies which manufacture and export a variety of food packaging, labelling and irrigation equipment for various destinations around the world.

The potential of the Chaffey electorate will undoubtedly focus on the future of our rural industries, especially horticulture but more particularly value-added products and tourism. The major horticultural industries are already launching into current opportunities. For example, in the wine grape area, with the Riverland producing about 40 per cent of the State's wine and with South Australia producing 70 per cent of the nation's exports, the potential is enormous. Australian wine producers are currently poised to take centre stage on world markets. In the past year there has been a growth of over 35 per cent in exports (representing 57 million litres) earning about \$285 million, which is still less than 1 per cent of the world market.

I wish to put this potential into perspective for the Riverland. I use the term 'Riverland' advisedly and respectfully note that the electorate of Chaffey comprises six Riverland local government areas and, although the District Council of Morgan is a member of the Riverland and Local Government Association, I acknowledge that it forms part of the electorate of my colleague the member for Custance. If the industry is to meet its national objective of \$1 billion of exports by the year 2001—and from indications to date this potential will be achieved—it will require the investment of \$600 million in vineyards, \$460 million in inventory and \$150 million in wine processing facilities throughout the country.

If the Riverland's share of such an investment were to be achieved only on a *pro rata* of production basis, this would require investment of about \$200 million. The Riverland has the infrastructure to capitalise on this potential. I will actively pursue this through the Government's plans for the wine industry and regional development and its objective to be competitive in such areas as power costs, water quality, workers compensation, State taxes and charges, and shipping services.

I also acknowledge my colleagues the members for Custance, Light, Mawson and MacKillop who, I imagine, will jealously guard their own wine labels. However, I remind them and the rest of the House, as I will continue to do during the remainder of my term in this place, that the majority of the bottles of wine produced in this State contain a significantly large percentage of quality Riverland grapes, recognising that the export growth that has been and is being achieved and the potential that is available could not have happened and will not happen without the substantial plantings and production that is occurring in the Riverland.

Although import competition continues to undermine the

citrus industry, two major growth trends provide valuable confidence. In the fresh juice market, single strength fresh juice now accounts for about 30 per cent of the orange juice market. That is an increase of 15 per cent compared with two years ago—a dramatic growth—and it is on track to achieve a medium term industry target of over 50 per cent, achievable only with fresh Australian citrus products. Export figures to the end of 1993 are at record levels with national exports approaching 50 000 tonnes in comparison with just over 30 000 tonnes in previous years. South Australia's Riverland leads the way with nearly 40 per cent of those exports, but more particularly, because of the region's fruit fly freedom status, the Riverland is the only region currently exporting to the United States of America, and this is after 20 years of attempting to penetrate that market. Exports commenced only two years ago in 1992 with a mere 2 500 tonnes, increasing in 1993 to 4 200 tonnes, while the estimate for exports to the USA this year is about 7 000 tonnes. This alone illustrates the importance of the maintenance of a fruit fly free status, and I will be working closely with the Government on behalf of the electorate to provide whatever resources are required to maintain that status.

In the whole horticultural arena there is visible growth and development in the electorate. While two years ago the Sturt Highway between Waikerie and Kingston-on-Murray was flanked by only two vineyards of the 1970s and 1980s, it is now largely lined with irrigated development comprising not just vineyards but broad scale production of potatoes, onions and carrots—and not only for fresh production but for new exports. For example, a Riverland processor in the past six months has written first time contracts for the export of carrot juice to Japan.

There are major opportunities for continuing tourism development in the electorate. As well as a focus on obvious river activities and industry production, flora and fauna from local wetlands is being appreciated as a quality offering. The uniqueness of our national parks, now associated with Danggali, Chowilla and Calperum land-holdings, is internationally recognised and will undoubtedly generate ecotourism and, I believe, sensitive and topical management options. I also believe that the region's sporting facilities are underestimated for their potential to bring tourists to the area. The climate, facilities and well grown grounds, whether they be hockey fields, bowling greens, golf courses, or soccer or football ovals, are of a standard that is envied around the State.

I turn now to the issue of challenges. Some of the issues and challenges that confront the Chaffey electorate because of their nature will be ongoing. However, some can and must be resolved. Although they are broad and varied, I will separate them into three or four categories, highlight some examples and, where applicable, indicate the way in which the community, the new Government and I, as the local member, can provide a positive and useful contribution to the enhancement of both the electorate and the State. My comments are in no way intended to be all encompassing but offer a spectrum of insight through some current windows before the electorate. Some of these may be direct impediments to progress while others will merely be likely to retard the rate of realisation of the region's potential.

It is not my intention to deal specifically with individual industries in this address, as I am sure this will happen in the future in this House: rather, I aim to look across some of the challenges that will transpose the region. The first challenge I propose concerns attitude. The word 'parochialism' is

strongly emotive in the Riverland and has historically been overused as an easy excuse for lack of progress and success regarding some local issues. The five major local communities have distinct and proud histories as well as vehement rivalries on the sporting fields every week. This flows over into the commercial arena and must be acknowledged. However, this attitude must be put into perspective and at times better utilised as a resource. Strong but sensitive community leadership is required to respect local identity and harness, control and direct these assets of spirit, ideas and energy. Local compromise will continue to be a requisite factor.

Another attitudinal issue is the lifestyle approach to primary producing. Traditionally and historically, rural market returns have, I believe, provided a standard of living that rural producers were willing to accept, particularly during cycles of low commodity prices. This attitude is the same, in principle, for both dry land and horticultural producers except that the latter over the past decade have been subject to greater commodity price pressure because of import competition from countries with lower wage costs. Secondly, in rural production, the Chaffey electorate has offered some attractive and useful employment opportunities, including part-time and seasonal work. This, I believe, has by default kept some horticultural properties alive by offering off-farm income. It has indirectly fostered and supported hobby farm and lifestyle attractions and retarded redevelopment. It has also made some operators in an attitudinal sense less responsive to market demands, market opportunities and quality requirements. I believe that market forces are influencing those producers who have the current viability and determination to stay in the rural industry, to adapt and to respond accordingly. However, we can afford no lapses.

I turn now to the second arena of challenges—structural challenges. A ready example is the labour market. As I have already expounded upon, irrigated horticulture, related manufacturing and tourism drive the local economy. Although mechanisation is progressing at an observable rate in production and manufacturing areas, they are still heavily dependent upon a high labour input. Couple this with a seasonal work force and the impact of shift work requirements and we have employers in industry hamstrung and retarded by over regulation and inflexible employment terms in the workplace.

Importantly, though, I am delighted that our announced industrial relations reforms, as outlined in Her Excellency's speech, will have a positive impact on the area. With a focus on enterprise agreements, they will provide the opportunity for flexibility between employer and employees and, in doing so, provide for greater reward for performance by employees. Although it is a Federal issue, I will also be working to fight against the totally unproductive superannuation guarantee levy being applied to various groups of casual and seasonal workers, which currently is providing no real benefit to either the employee or the Government.

Structurally, the size of historic horticultural holdings, the associated problems of rural residential housing in horticultural areas and urban and industrial expansion into traditional horticultural producing areas also creates a cobweb entangling the rate of future development. I am not saying that big is necessarily the best or the only way to go: specific examples can be produced to support or justify almost any property size. However, bigger, in the greater number of cases, is providing more profitable options. I believe options related to facilitating or assisting the amalgamation of titles

should be considered, particularly where owner/operator housing becomes surplus, and the excising of rural houses from properties is justified. Land banking options should also be investigated.

Further, there needs to be a consistent approach in the supplementary development plans of all Riverland councils with regard to protecting and maintaining existing horticultural development, together with a practical and realistic approach to industrial expansion. Social adjustment will continue, and there will be the inevitable fallout of some producers who unfortunately may not have a viable future. However, there is that group of small to medium size properties where efficiency and income are being limited by property size, the capital base or the skills of the operator, or by some combination of the three. I believe that it is in this area that restructuring assistance would improve viability. It is because of this that I will be supporting the valuable work of the rural counselling services, so that such operators will survive to benefit from the initiatives of the Government's rural policy.

In particular, I am delighted to be part of the new Government and of our present rural policy to review the criteria for rural assistance, particularly with respect to a change in the criteria for assistance to long-term rather than short-term viability. I am also delighted to be offering our young farmer incentive scheme of 50 per cent interest rate subsidy, the abolition of stamp duty for loan refinancing and the abolition of stamp duty for inter-generational property transfers. They will be of tremendous assistance.

Also, in the past two years, significant structural reform has been achieved in producer cooperatives. It has been overdue and, unfortunately, not without some loss to some shareholders. Structurally, the electorate, through the Riverland Development Corporation, is now well placed to formally assess changes required, to assess specific development options and to relay and coordinate a development strategy which is part of a new consistent statewide development focus and priority.

The Riverland Development Corporation was born out of adversity in 1985 with the demise of the then Riverland fruit cannery and has been historically criticised for generally being a collector and assessor of information without being a facilitator of change. However, I believe that phase has now definitely passed, with a new board structure and funding, and accountability from June 1993. With the current Riverland development strategy in progress and due for completion in the next three months and with the board's and community's renewed appreciation that action and delivery of changes is the requirement, I believe greater progress is now imminent. Couple this with our new Government's plans for priority and focus in regional development through, for example, our office and the Director of Regional Development, enterprise zones being available statewide and also specific incentives for export and value-added growth, all under the umbrella of a revamped economic development authority, then the Riverland, through the Riverland Development Corporation, is better placed than most areas to immediately take advantage of these joint reforms.

With respect to local government in Chaffey, structural change is happening. There is some unrealistic pressure and impatience from a few individuals for this. However, I hold the view that it is progressing usefully via continued sharing of resources, both physical and human, as well as by a progression to increase the use of contracted services.

Structural reform of Government services, whether they

be in transport, health or education, is inevitable. However, just as our election promise indicated, no schools will be closed on purely financial criteria. I will be working with the Government on behalf of the electorate and the community to ensure that it is the quality of services that must be maintained and improved. For example, I note that in the Chaffey electorate I have not only four major hospitals but about 20 primary schools and four major high schools, and I am particularly aware of and sensitive to the community concerns in this arena of quality of services. By way of example, I mention the education arena, where subject choice and the quality of curriculum available is high on that agenda for assistance and support to the community.

A most explicit example of the combination of the result of such attitudinal and structural progress is the current progression of unity within the Riverland citrus industry. Frustration over recent years at having three different grower groups claiming to represent the interests of citrus growers has now passed, with the formal amalgamation of the Murray Citrus Growers Association, the citrus section of the South Australian Farmers Federation and the Riverland Growers Unity Association. Indeed, I believe the formal constitution was approved last evening in Berri. Having had a significant involvement in the citrus industry, I know that both the industry and the region will be now in a much stronger position because of this.

What is also most heartening to me—and it is particularly evident over these past two months since my election—is that this attitudinal and structural progress is already being endorsed just through the election and presence of the new Liberal Government. Individuals and organisations in the electorate were getting impatient for a change to a Liberal Government. In the first two months, their general expectations have not been disappointed. Indeed, this pro-progress, pro-development, pro-get business, pro-let's think of quality of services attitude (and I say this with great information from the electorate) has already been an infectious and a contagious facilitator.

The next category of challenge is that of infrastructure. Two areas of major effect and impact are transport and irrigation supply. The Chaffey electorate, in common with all other country areas of South Australia, has suffered severely and dramatically over the past 10 years because of the reduction in Federal and State resources allocated to our country roads and railways. The reality is that our country areas still produce the majority of wealth for this State, yet they have been strangled and penalised by either inefficient or unmaintained infrastructure to get that production to export markets. The intended fuel taxes have not been passed on and progressively have been turned off to a drip.

South of the Sturt Highway the electorate encompasses significant grain producing areas in the District Councils of Loxton and Waikerie. Indeed, as the past Mayor of Waikerie, with the council servicing—or attempting to service—approximately 700 kilometres of unsealed roads, mainly in the grain producing area, I know the problem only too well. Roads designed for six to eight tonne farm trucks are now carrying 25-plus tonne tri-axle semitrailers and neither the equation of dollars nor the roads will continue to stand up. Where at least we still have the railway service in the electorate to Loxton, I will be fighting hard with my colleague the member for Ridley to achieve the best possible solution.

Specifically, two roadway priorities continue to be at the

forefront of the electorate and, indeed, shall remain at the forefront for the State. The first, of course, is the Berri bridge, although I like to refer to it as the Riverland bridge, because in recent years all Riverland councils reaffirmed their support for it as part of the Sturt Highway upgrading to national highway status. The saga of this bridge is long and political and will continue to be one of my greatest single priorities for the region. Suffice to say, for the information of the newer members of this House, that the bridge was promised and all but started by the Tonkin Liberal Government in the early 1980s but scuttled by the subsequent Labor Government of 1982.

I can assure the electorate, as we did prior to the election, that this project has again become our priority and all energy and effort will be employed in first ensuring that the Federal Government puts an immediate time scale commitment on the bridge plans for the Sturt Highway in the Riverland. The second ongoing roadway priority is the saga of the Morgan/Burra/Spalding road. Although technically not in the Chaffey electorate, this road services a national network for which the Riverland is the hub, for both major tourist traffic and heavy road haulage. Whether it be, for example, the Brisbane/Sydney route to Perth, the Melbourne/Perth or the Melbourne/Alice Springs and Darwin route, this road is the most effective route.

I note that it is probably one of the most politicised roads in the nation but, until its complete upgrade, I can assure the House that I and my colleague the member for Custance will continue to keep it that way. Thankfully, with our new Government's plan for targeting additional funds for rural arterial roads, I expect to see significant progress on this road in the near future. The other major area of infrastructure reform specific to the Chaffey electorate involves the provision of irrigation water. Without irrigation the Riverland would have virtually no industry, and currently about 23 000 hectares is under irrigation, including the Government irrigation areas.

During the 1970s and early 1980s the Government irrigation areas were being rehabilitated by replacing open channels with pipelines and automating pumping stations using State Government loan funds. This rehabilitation was suspended in 1984 but recommenced in 1992, although on a negotiated cost sharing basis of 40 per cent Federal funding, 40 per cent State funding and a 20 per cent grower contribution for a project costing around \$40 million over nine years, the Federal funding being triennial and conditional on efficiency and productivity improvements.

Such infrastructure expenditure will need to be carefully assessed to ensure that irrigation water is not designated hydraulically or designed for areas whose future supply would be unsuitable because of problems such as drainage or unsuitable soil types. This assessment is currently in progress, and I believe that fair compensation must be provided to the minority of growers so affected. The maximising of the efficiency of water use and productivity produced by such improvements is already well evident from the areas rehabilitated in the late 1970s, as well as the resultant benefits from a significant reduction in drainage flows.

Indeed, the next step required to further these benefits, not just for the Riverland but for the State as a whole, is for growers to self-manage the operation of these irrigation areas. Most Riverland growers who operate under private irrigation schemes—for example, Renmark Irrigation Trust in the east, Golden Heights and Sunlands in the west—strongly support private control and operation. They have been great examples

to the Government schemes and growers. With the improvements already demonstrated in the Government schemes that have already been rehabilitated and the greater control given to the Government irrigation advisory boards, and with the new Liberal Government's offer for the growers to own the schemes for their contribution to the rehabilitation, I will be endeavouring to see that the growers appreciate the value of this offer and that they have the opportunity to take it up as soon as practicable.

I am also pleased to note, in the area of infrastructure, in addition to the commendable commencement of the natural gas pipeline to the Riverland this year, three further cases where our Government has a priority focus that will further assist local export growth. They are: harbor improvement; the Adelaide Airport upgrade for increased air freight; and the Adelaide/Darwin rail link priority. The final broad area of challenge is that of natural resource maintenance. Specifically, the River Murray is a national resource and asset that must never be forgotten or underestimated. Its importance not just to the Chaffey electorate but to the State of South Australia is a subject that I expect to be bringing before this Parliament on numerous occasions.

Time today does not allow for a detailed presentation of all aspects. However, suffice to say in summary that, from a development viewpoint, future economic growth at this moment is being limited because of the quantity of irrigation water currently available. The confidence, capital and land presently exist. We must keep the developers in this State by immediately pursuing all options for increasing the availability and flexibility of irrigation allocations. From the environmental perspective—and I acknowledge the intrinsic relationship with development—quality aspects, whether they be salinity or nutrient pollution, I am pleased to say, are incorporated into the new Government's South Australian water plan. This will encourage research and development of water management programs through the establishment of an MFP Hydrology and Water Resources Centre of Excellence. In addition, I am pleased to be already assisting three local councils to negotiate detailed options for the removal of floodplain effluent basins.

In conclusion, I am extremely pleased, not just for my sake but more importantly for that of the electorate, to be standing here as a member of Dean Brown's Government team, a Government team that I will be working hard to ensure governs this State well into the next century. It is a time for firm decisions. My experiences to date in public life have taught me at least one thing: for progress and development and improving services, not everyone can be pleased all the time: there must be some give and take. If any one group or area or section of the community within the electorate demands special attention, ultimately it is likely to be at the expense of another group. Our best future will come via a team effort of consultation and cooperation, and I look forward to being part of that team. Also, as a member of the Liberal Party in Government I will reiterate my comments at a public forum in the Berri town hall during the election campaign, in that I am free to vote as I choose. The Party room does not have absolute control over how I exercise my vote. Unlike the Labor Party, no declaration has to be signed to abide formally by the Party line. Individual Liberal members have the prerogative to take their own stance and, because of that, I want to assure the Chaffey electors that if there is overwhelming support for specific Riverland issues I will naturally consider that choice and those options.

I have very deliberately focused this address solely on the

Chaffey electorate and particularly on its economic wellbeing. I believe very strongly that if a community is prospering, services and facilities prosper and social problems are minimised. My first responsibility is to represent the people of Chaffey. My accountability will ultimately be to them. I will be aiming to provide that representation with energy and integrity, fairness and pride and, in doing so, retain the trust that was afforded me at the December election.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Speaker and assure you of my support in this difficult and sensitive role. I would also like to offer my condolences to the relatives and friends of the Hon. John Burdett and the Hon. Jessie Cooper.

Today I want to recognise in my Address in Reply contribution that this is the centenary of women's suffrage in South Australia, and to put on record my support for a call by former Western Australian Premier Carmen Lawrence for a target of 50 per cent of women MPs to take up positions around this country in State and Federal Parliament.

There is no doubt that all major Parties in Australia continue to reinforce a boys club image to the wider community. The way we organise and conduct political Parties, Parliaments and Governments in Australia makes it extremely difficult for women to get a look in, and both major Parties are equally guilty. Indeed, if we continue to preselect candidates the way we have in the past, it will take hundreds of years before women achieve a 50 per cent share of parliamentary seats across Australia. In fact, earlier today the Hon. Carolyn Pickles told me that on the current preselection levels it would take 300 years for women to achieve 50 per cent participation.

A great deal of lip service has been given to the need to encourage women into politics in Australia. Women have tended to be put into marginal seats where their understanding of family and community issues are said to make them stronger candidates, and in doing so the special skills of women, as better listeners, better consensus negotiators and conflict resolvers, are usually highlighted. This in itself is patronising, and there is a huge gap between rhetoric and action.

When it comes to safe seats or real power in political Parties the boys club that I mentioned before tends to always prevail. Just watch out, Sir, for the tactics that the 'Stop Bronwyn Bishop' campaign will use when it swings into action. Too often factional concerns have overridden community needs when it comes to preselecting women as well as other candidates, and a hundred reasons will often be put forward about why a woman candidate will not be right for the job.

Across Australia, political processes, Parties and institutions conspire against women's involvement in politics, and as a result we are wasting a huge pool of talent. With the centenary of Federation just a few years away we must move now to catch up with the real world. Australia lags woefully behind many other nations in terms of the proportion of women MPs in Legislatures. I have a list here of women in Parliament supplied by the Inter-Parliamentary Union. In Australia, 8.2 per cent of members of Parliament are women, and that means we are behind Syria, Bangladesh, the Philippines and Angola and, in our immediate vicinity, Indonesia and New Zealand; and we are way behind a raft of other countries, such as China with 21 per cent, Cuba with

22.8 per cent, Denmark with 33 per cent, Finland with 39 per cent, Germany with 20.5 per cent, the Netherlands with 29.3 per cent, Norway with 35.8 per cent, Sweden with 33.5 per cent and Vietnam with 18.5 per cent. We have a considerable way to go.

In South Australia I certainly hope that my own Party, the ALP, will make an heroic leap forward by preselecting a huge number of women candidates for the next State election. Our goal—indeed the goal of all Parties—should be 50 per cent of preselections for women candidates across all types of seats, whether they are safe seats, marginal seats or unwinnable seats. I am not calling for a quota but 50 per cent across-the-board.

I want to take up the point made by the member for Napier in her maiden speech: we must remove some of the impediments to women's participation. A century ago the big debate in this House was about the need to pay members of Parliament. Without that step Parliaments would not have had working people elected to them; they would have been the exclusive club of the privileged and land-owning few. Without pay for members of Parliament we would not have seen Labor Governments elected across Australia.

So in this year that we celebrate the centenary of women's suffrage in South Australia we should look at removing other obstacles to women becoming MPs. We should look at child care arrangements at Parliament House, we should rethink the hours that Parliament sits, and we should re-examine the way Parliament conducts itself, because it is quite true that in our Parties and in Parliament we should ensure that our rules and processes invite rather than impede and include rather than exclude women's participation.

Before going on to some economic issues, I want to also talk about one of the new portfolio responsibilities that the Leader of the Opposition has assigned to me, that is, the area of the arts. The Adelaide Festival of the Arts is the country's pre-eminent cultural festival, but that does not mean that we should not re-examine the way that it is structured. I believe that it must truly go national if it is to retain its position as Australia's premier cultural event. I think it is now time for mature and constructive debate about the future of our festival. We need to seriously examine the pros and cons of staging an annual festival. We also need to look closely at the organisation of the festival and its board and the position and tenure of its artistic director.

My own view is that the Adelaide Festival will need a truly national board if it is to secure its future as the major festival in Australia. The board's main function should be fundraising, and it must be strong enough to protect the artistic director to give him or her real and unfettered independence. A restructured national board must be an active board—not a passive advisory structure with a few big names thrown in for status, which I understand is currently under consideration. An active national board would have a better chance of obtaining Federal funds and corporate sponsorship at national and international levels, rather than a parochial board with a club-like image.

I believe our festival would also be enhanced artistically if each director were guaranteed at least two festivals. This would strengthen the role and scope of the artistic director and give him or her greater flexibility in the mix of artistic talent selected to perform. With once-only directors their artistic vision is often limited by the availability of artists during a particular two-week period, and a director can be seriously weakened by having only one festival and rapidly becomes a lame duck when the next festival's director is

appointed, often a year before the serving director's festival occurs. This means that, once the next director is chosen, they could have less clout with the board, the Government and sponsors.

I think it is time to seriously consider whether or not we need an annual festival. When I was Minister of Tourism I was told by airlines, by people from the Australian Tourism Commission, by international wholesalers and national funding bodies that they could give massive promotion only to annual events. It has been put to me by many people with a great deal more experience in the arts than me—and there is quite clearly division in this—that an annual festival would somehow weaken the festival artistically and would somehow compromise artistic integrity or even weaken their public appeal. Of course, in Australia the Melbourne, Perth and Sydney festivals are annual events, and indeed a number of major international festivals, including Edinburgh, are annual events.

This issue does need to be debated and explored and, if it is decided that the Adelaide Festival should remain a biennial event, I believe the Fringe linked with WOMAD in non-festival years, and perhaps with Writers Week, should be held each year. The Fringe has grown significantly in status and now attracts a massive audience: it can now stand alone like other fringe festivals internationally. Indeed in Edmonton, which has quite a celebrated fringe festival, there is no festival for it to be the fringe of, and several others in Canada have international reputations. There is no reason why the Fringe could not become an annual event.

There also needs to be much greater integration of government input into the festival. It should not be just the prerogative of the Arts Department. Its importance to business, trade and tourism needs to be emphasised and reinforced. That is why in Government my department sponsored and underwrote WOMAD and sponsored this year's 'Open Roof' as part of our Business Asia push. We need to build conventions and promotions in and around the festival, just as we have with the Grand Prix in the past.

On behalf of the Opposition, today I pledge the Labor Party's full support for the MFP. I was pleased and relieved to read the joint statement made earlier this month on the future development of MFP Australia. That statement, by the Federal Minister Chris Schacht and the South Australian Minister for Industrial Affairs in this Chamber, was a much more positive signal for the MFP's future than we have been hearing from the Liberal Party during the past year.

Previously, the Leader of the Opposition and I have been concerned about the conflicting statements being made about the MFP by the present Premier. It appeared that he was seriously at odds with the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development about the future direction of the MFP. Indeed, the Premier's statements in January served only to further undermine confidence in the project. It seemed that the message he was sending out in January to investors, nationally and internationally, was that the new State Government did not want the MFP to go ahead. Indeed, the Premier's statements seemed clumsy and were reported interstate and, I am told, overseas, as a thumbs down to the MFP generally. That was certainly the tenor of the ABC's national report, which said that it was the end of the MFP. I was also concerned that the Premier's January statements may have put at risk Commonwealth funding for the multifunction polis. I am not talking about just Better Cities funding: there is also a major ongoing financial commitment by the Federal Government to the MFP

Corporation.

The Premier was also reported as announcing publicly that Gillman had been axed and that the name of the MFP would be changed to 'SA Technopolis'. It appears that the Premier has now been persuaded by Senator Schacht, the member for Kavel—the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development—and the international and national board that he was heading in the wrong direction. The name 'SA Technopolis' lasted only two weeks before the Premier was forced to abandon it, and I am surprised that that sudden flip flop on this issue did not attract greater media attention.

I am pleased that Gillman is still part of the project. Let me make it clear that the MFP was never just about Gillman, as the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Premier, was at pains to reinforce. That is why the MFP legislation which he introduced into this Parliament and which was passed unanimously, as I understand it, incorporated Technology Park and Science Park from 1 July last year; and that is why in Government the former Premier and I moved to give Technology Park and Science Park enterprise zone status, which provides a total exemption from State taxes and local council rates as well as providing a range of other benefits.

If the MFP is to have a strong future and receive credibility internationally, it must be much more than a technology park and much more than an SA Technopolis, because there are hundreds of those around the world. Urban planning and a housing component must be central to the long-term future of the MFP in order to receive international endorsement as well as attracting Federal funding. I am therefore pleased that in their joint statement the South Australian Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and the Federal Minister for Science reiterated and reinforced the need for the MFP to establish an environmentally-sustainable urban development model. One of the reasons that MFP Australia has the support of major international figures—from its international advisory board and beyond—is that it is recognised overseas as unique in the way in which it combines industry development with urban development that is both people-centred and environmentally responsible. As well, it will involve the development of national and international business opportunities in the areas of information technology, technology communications, education services and environmental management.

The MFP must be seen in the long term to make a significant contribution to Australian industry development and the internationalisation of our economy, with a special focus, of course, on the Asian/Pacific region. In doing so, Gillman must continue to be part of that long-term future. The development of this degraded site is one of the key reasons that the MFP was awarded to South Australia. I am pleased that the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development in South Australia has disagreed with his Premier in reaffirming that Gillman will remain an important part of the project.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I agree that the Minister has been totally consistent in respect of this matter. His view in respect of the development of the MFP is similar to that of Senator Schacht and me. It is pleasing that together they were able to convince the Premier to abandon some of his wilder plans. I am certainly pleased that the joint statement reaffirmed that Gillman will remain an important part of the project. I am also pleased that the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and Senator

Schacht have agreed and publicly stated that the clean up of the core site environment should proceed to deal with both the urban environmental problems and to demonstrate Australia's capabilities in this area. They stated that environmental restoration and important water catchment management strategies will be implemented as a priority whilst urban and vital industrial development options are further considered by the MFP Board.

I hope that the new State Government will endorse the position adopted by the former Government and continue moves to ensure 10 year tax-free enterprise zone status for all MFP sites. This could be an invaluable marketing tool. Of course, enterprise zone status was central in our discussions in relation to South Australia's bid to win the Orion project.

I would also like to place on record the Opposition's support for Ross Kennan's role in the past seven months in relation to the development of the MFP; I think he is making an outstanding contribution. I was pleased to see his statement of 4 February, in which the MFP board specifically endorsed the first centre of excellence, information, technology and telecommunications to be based at Technology Park. Mr Kennan said:

Extension of the project's core site to include Adelaide's Technology Park and other land should result in an earlier start to MFP Australia's urban development component.

He went on to say:

The environmental clean up of the Gillman section of MFP's core site would continue in parallel with any urban development on the extended site.

I was delighted to see that. There has to be bipartisan support for the MFP, and it will receive bipartisan support. It will certainly get the support of the Opposition, because we will not engage in the same process as the Government while in Opposition, which was to continually white ant the project.

Just as importantly, the Opposition will continue to support strongly South Australia's bid to win the Royal Australian Air Force's \$700 million PC3 Orion project. The refurbishment project will involve the upgrading of Australia's PC3 maritime patrol aircraft, which currently operate from the RAAF base at Edinburgh. When I was Minister of Business and Regional Development I was chairman of the Orion bid task force. This was the largest project of its type on offer. It has the potential to boost our defence and electronics industry and to generate hundreds of high-tech jobs in this State. This project is very important for South Australia and it deserves the strongest bipartisan support.

Early in January I offered to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development my support and that of all members of the Opposition in talks with the Federal Labor Government and with key Keating Ministers, such as Defence Minister Robert Ray. We must all put South Australia's interests before Party political concerns.

I have been informed by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development that short listing of the projects has recently been completed. I understand that we are looking pretty good in that two of the short-listed companies have nominated South Australia as their preferred site. It is certainly logical that much of the work on the Orions be carried out in Adelaide at RAAF Edinburgh, where the Orions are based, and at Salisbury's Technology Park, where a number of subcontractors bidding for the project are based.

I have previously mentioned the enterprise zones. It was

noted in my discussions with various people tendering for work on the project that those enterprise zones and the other incentives that we were offering were central to their consideration in publicly nominating South Australia as their preferred location. I am pleased to have seen some nods from the Minister, indicating that the new Government will endorse and continue enterprise zone status. One of the tenderers, Lockheed—the original manufacturer of the Orions—publicly endorsed a presence at Technology Park if it were successful. The enterprise zone status was certainly important in those negotiations.

It is vitally important that the new State Government, with Labor's support, keeps up a vigorous public campaign to have the Orions upgraded in Australia and not overseas, because I understand that two companies have nominated South Australia while another has opted to have the work done overseas—I believe in the United States. We must win that battle to have the Orions upgraded in Australia. If we do that, I am convinced that we will win the battle to have them upgraded here in South Australia.

We have an opportunity to show the Federal Labor Government that the Government, the Opposition, business and unions in this State are united in their resolve to win this project, worth hundreds of millions of dollars to South Australia. In technological terms, it is the important next step on from the submarine project and from the smart end of the frigate project. The next few months are critical: the Federal Government is currently going through that final analysis of the bids; a decision will be made in the next few months, and certainly we remain ready to assist the Government in terms of any talks with our Federal colleagues.

I will be looking at a number of projects in the arts area which I intend to float and for which I will seek bipartisan support. I have written to the Federal Minister for the Arts suggesting a millennium project. A national arts project will be built around the turn of the millennium and the centenary of Federation will occur in January 2001. In Britain the millennium debate is well under way with the establishment of a millennium commission which has very strong support from the John Major Government and from all Parties in Britain. There are proposals by Lord Palumbo and others for major projects to protect Britain's heritage by restoring national monuments and historic buildings. The respected British architect, Sir Richard Rogers, is suggesting marking the millennium with major new building works of national importance: others are suggesting expos, urban forests, the greening of cities and a new version of the 1951 Festival of Britain. London's *Sunday Times* has been promoting and publicising these ideas. I am currently talking with a number of major artists around Australia together with people involved in the arts about developing a millennium submission, and I will report back to the House on that at a future date.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Mawson. I remind this House that this is the honourable member's maiden speech and I request that he be extended the normal courtesies.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I express my support for the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I join other members in the House in congratulating Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell for her address during the opening of Parliament. Her Excellency is highly respected in the wider community and is a credit to herself and the office which she holds. Mr Acting Speaker, I congratulate the Speaker on his

position; I know that he will instil the standards and respect that are required in the Parliament.

Sir Douglas Mawson lived from 1882 to 1958 and was an Antarctic explorer. From 1911 to 1914 he led an expedition to explore Australia's sector of the Antarctic. His two companions, Mertz and Ninnis, died but, after 20 days alone, Mawson reached his base. I am proud to represent an electorate named after Sir Douglas Mawson.

I wish to thank the people of Mawson for the confidence that they overwhelmingly showed in me at the polling booths on 11 December 1993. I assure them that I shall never forget their support and that I hereby give my full commitment to them.

Whilst Mawson is a seat that has been represented in the House for many years, it underwent a huge change in the redistribution and, as such, is really a new seat. It takes in the magnificent wine growing area of the McLaren Vale district which was previously in the seat of Alexandra, held by our Premier the Hon. Dean Brown. Dean Brown had particular interest in the area and served the electorate well. The other part of the seat is an exciting mix of new and established residential areas which sit mainly on the eastern side of South Road and filter through to the grazing country of the Onkaparinga hills. The Hon. Susan Lenehan held this part of the seat for some years, and I congratulate her on the contribution she made.

I am sure most members regard their seat as of significant value to the State, and I can assure members that my electorate of Mawson is certainly in this category. Having lived and worked in and around the electorate and the southern area for two decades, I have a strong passion for the south. I intend to fight in whatever manner necessary to ensure that the south, over the next 10 years, gets more than a 50 per cent share of our State Government resources and after that its fair share.

The people of Mawson are family folk who are generally community minded and hard working; they enjoy their sport and recreation, and they do not get around with their head in the clouds. In other words, they do not expect to have everything handed to them. However, they are not prepared to see their children's education suffer, and no longer will they put up with having the highest youth unemployment in Australia. They are not prepared to have 70 per cent of the electorate travelling north down O'Halloran Hill every day just to get a job. As is only fair, they expect to see jobs created in the south. I give notice to members that I will be seeking their help to ensure that this problem is addressed once and for all, and as soon as possible. We must look at tax breaks, infrastructure and the amending of the 2020 Vision plan to give the forgotten south a fair go. After all is said and done, we pay our fair share of taxes and we have done for decades, yet over the last 10 years under a Labor Government the south received only \$1 of State funding to every \$2 in the equivalent northern area. It is simply not good enough and I will make sure it is changed. You only have to take a drive north to Modbury or Dernancourt to see the difference.

One of the major problems facing new residents in the residential areas of Mawson has been the lack of transport and community facilities, and the generally appalling roads. Forward subdivisional planning has been poor to say the least, and that has caused much stress for residents who have bought property in a quiet area only to find that, within 12 months, a new subdivision has opened up and their quiet road has become a major thoroughfare. It is up to the State Government to amend the Development Act and the Land and

Business Agents Act to make sure that this situation no longer occurs. This would enable a complete staged development for the total section to be approved, a copy being provided to the purchaser when they sign the contract. The purchaser should also be made aware of existing uses in the area so that established businesses are not placed under undue pressure by residents complaining because they were not aware of those uses. *Caveat emptor* must be fully exercised.

Mawson has some of the most beautiful tourism icons in the State, from the breathtaking views on the Onkaparinga hills to the scenic rolling Southern Vales around the best red wine growing area in Australia. The tourism industry is labour intensive and it has tremendous potential for expansion in the Mawson electorate. I was involved in the Liberal Party's policy decision to spend \$750 000 on a tourism interpretative centre in McLaren Vale. This will be the catalyst for tourist expansion throughout the Fleurieu Peninsula and will create much needed jobs for many constituents in Mawson. TAFE has a hospitality course at Noarlunga, and I look forward to working with the college and the Southern Development Board in future educational programs to enhance tourism.

Anyone who has an interest in wine will agree that the McLaren Vale district produces world class red wines. The McLaren Vale wine district, thanks to the excellent work of the 40 plus wineries in the area, now exports wine throughout the world. However, research shows that export sales of premium wine from Australia, so far, is only the tip of an iceberg. Between 1994 and the year 2000 there will be huge increases in wine exports. It is imperative that the McLaren Vale district maintain its share of the increased market. I am pleased that I have been involved in the formation of the Liberal policy on the wine industry and the initiatives that we will introduce to bring additional water sources to the area. A further 5 000 acres (2 000 hectares) of vines needs to be planted in the next four to five years, and this also will create many jobs in the electorate of Mawson. I will continue to work closely with the wine industry and to support it wherever I can as it undertakes its expansion.

With respect to the whole of the South Australian wine industry, obviously it took note of the highly respected South Australian Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, who said that the only resource we South Australians could really rely upon was our brains. No-one can doubt that the South Australian industry used its brains and is now the example *par excellence* of value adding. It is the industry which is showing other Australian industries how to successfully transfer the philosophy of the pursuit of excellence, so evident in Australian sport, into the achievement of excellence and success in that most competitive of international arenas—wine.

Victoria's recent highly professional and successful promotion of its wines to leading British wine merchants clearly is a signal that it could well be plotting another steal. South Australia's pre-eminent position as Australia's leading wine State is at stake. Perhaps we can all learn from the Victorian Liberal Government, as even dyed-in-the-wool Labor voters have acknowledged to me that Victoria has turned the corner by creating a climate where exciting things can and do happen. I support our Government in clearly signalling a commitment of support to our wine industry by proudly promoting the industry. With Australia these days sinking under a plethora of festivals, perhaps now is the time, through our number plates, to tell the world that we are 'South Australia, The Wine State'. Another vital role for

Government in supporting the wine industry is to help to coordinate and support the various South Australian wine regions in their promotions, thus reinforcing the notion of 'South Australia, The Wine State'.

In terms of the environment, Mawson has some very sensitive areas including the Onkaparinga National Park; there is the land degradation of the hills face area and the need to protect the Willunga Basin from urban sprawl. Much work has already been done by our Liberal Government, and I have worked and intend to continue to work closely with the Minister on the protection of the Willunga Basin. Recently, an agreement was signed between the Government and the Willunga council on the protection of the basin. I acknowledge the work done by the Willunga council and the local community and look forward to working with them as we proceed towards the new supplementary development plan, which our Government would like to be finalised within two years.

Exciting and creative opportunities are available to address land degradation in the Hills in the Mawson electorate. I have already held discussions with Minister Wotton and Mr Dean Frankham on a paper weir method of reclaiming the eroded gullies. Schools and the local community can play a part in overcoming this problem, and I will continue to work with all interested parties to make sure that silt is not washed off these fragile hills subsequently to pollute the seabed.

Small business has been identified as one of the vital links in the recovery chain for South Australia. As someone who has spent 20 years of his life working in small business and who during that time with a partner created 15 full-time positions, I believe that I understand the problems that face small business in South Australia. The previous Labor Government seemed to be on a mission to destroy small business by massive tax increases—in fact, the highest in Australia over the past 10 years—regulations and red tape that stifled many expansion programs and complicated licences to operate businesses. When one looks at the employment background of members of the Labor Party, one sees why they could not comprehend the problems and importance of small business; only one member of the previous Labor Government had any small business experience. Until one has had to be accountable for one's own actions and pay for one's mistakes, it would be almost impossible to be accountable for other people's money.

That is why South Australia is in such a mess today. You must be able to manage the business of running Government through accountability and management. Simply creating public sector monopolies that become cash cows and throwing money at the problem is not and never will be the answer. That approach, which was the Labor approach, in South Australia has seen a deficit blow-out from a manageable \$2.5 billion 10 years ago to a staggering \$8.5 billion today (it is probably worth a smile, but our kids and those of members opposite will be paying for it for a long time), billions of dollars being required for unfunded liabilities over the next six or seven years, massive unemployment and run down public infrastructure being the result.

One of the solutions to the problem is to kickstart small business and to encourage new ones to open up. The Liberal Government realises this, and I commend it and, in particular, Premier Dean Brown and the Hon. John Olsen for the new initiatives that have already been introduced to help to get businesses going again. Mawson is an electorate that must rely on small businesses for job growth as it has no large industries. Therefore, I commit myself to the interests of

small business.

Before I turn to general State issues, I would like to record in *Hansard* some of the other issues that I am particularly interested in pursuing: Panalatinga Road; improved transport, particularly crossover and off-peak services; a police station and more police for Woodcroft and/or Reynella; an increase in the number of beds at the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital and the Noarlunga Hospital; a community hall for Woodcroft; general road improvements; and more facilities for the aged and our youth.

I now refer to the third arterial road. First, I want to congratulate the Mayor of Noarlunga, Ray Gilbert, and his council for the continual lobbying that the council and, in particular, Mayor Ray Gilbert have conducted over many years in pursuit of a third arterial road. Whilst for many years their calls fell on deaf ears, I am pleased to say that, with the assistance of the member for Karna, the member for Reynell and myself, their calls have now been heard. The Brown Government will build the third arterial road, commencing in 1995. No longer will it be used as a political football at elections. The south needs this road to create the necessary job opportunities that I have previously mentioned. Whilst talking about Mayor Ray Gilbert and the Noarlunga council, I wish to congratulate them on the professional manner in which they conduct the business of local government.

I could not give an Address in Reply speech without mentioning the mismanagement and ineptitude of the previous Labor Government. Starting with the State Bank, this was a massive loss. In fact, it is the single largest loss of any corporate body in the history of Australia. To many citizens the magnitude of this loss is incomprehensible, and we will have to live with this problem for many years. Secondly, development opportunities lost in the past 10 years add up to at least \$2.5 billion. We should think for a moment of the number of jobs that that alone has cost our State: scrimper, massive losses in SGIC, WorkCover, the ASER project, Marineland and, of course, now the Grand Prix. It is no wonder that the confidence has been sapped out of South Australia in recent years. Yet, despite all this, I have never heard one apology from any member on the other side of the House. We do not even see them hanging their heads in shame. If I had been a part of this, I would not be seeking office, for what right would one have to represent the people of South Australia?

Until about eight years ago, the economy of South Australia was something of which we could all be proud. There were no real peaks and troughs but rather it was a 'steady as she goes' State, a good State in which to do business. With even ordinary business management skills this State would have been the first to climb out of the 'recession we were all meant to have'. The Liberal Party asked some 96 questions in this House, over nearly two years, before the other side would agree to look into the matter. In other words, as was becoming very normal, they sat on their hands. Yet, in the short time I have been in this House, I have witnessed a disturbing arrogance from the Opposition. In other words, it appears that, even after the public had handed down their sentence on 11 December, they have still not learnt.

Their only defence has been to try to push the blame somewhere else, during poor performances at Question Time. Neither the public of South Australia nor I will forget their incompetence, as we are the ones who have had to bear the brunt and we will have to do that for a long time. Our Liberal Government will need more than one term to fix this very deep-seated mess, and I call on the public to give us the

necessary time to fix Labor's disasters.

On a positive note, I switch to the matter of the future of South Australia and the new era for our State under the Brown Liberal Government. Over the past two or three years, the Liberal Party has worked hard to introduce new and diverse blood to the Parliamentary Liberal Party. This new blood, under the proven management skills of our Premier Dean Brown and the experience, loyalty and capability of our Ministers, together with the skills that those of us who are new to the Parliament bring, will allow South Australia to rebuild and once again be a State of which we can all justifiably be proud.

No-one is suggesting that it will always be an easy road to recovery or that it will be painless. In fact, some pain will be required in order to give our children the future they deserve. However, I am delighted to say that out in the electorate one can already feel a revitalised confidence. Business is starting to get busier and investors are looking once again at South Australia. Much of this has been the result of tireless efforts since 11 December by our Ministers as they roll out the blueprint for South Australia. In fact, Ministers such as Olsen, Dale Baker, Stephen Baker, Wotton and Oswald have been ringing me from their ministerial offices on weekends because they know they have to work hard to fix the mess. On our side, there is a saying: 'If you fail to plan, you plan to fail'.

We are well aware of this, and after years without a business plan for South Australia the Brown Government's recovery plan is a welcome breath of fresh air. That is why the confidence levels are on the up. The new directions, the business approach to Government and incentives recently released and those to be released in the near future are encouraging South Australians to have a go. Removal of unnecessary red tape, an open door to new investment, a plan to market South Australia, the recognition of the importance of the rural community, fully value-added agricultural products and a dedicated Government will lead the way in our recovery.

We live in a changing world. We must realise the importance of being articulate, flexible, proactive and also reactive when necessary, and we must also be ready to pounce instantly on opportunities for our State. Our Premier has a proven record in this. It was reinforced only a few weeks ago during a short trip overseas. He actually did bring home some bacon, something that members of the previous Government were not able to demonstrate during their frequent and long jaunts overseas. Another promise that we must uphold is that of open and fully accountable Government. The people of South Australia deserve this, and in the future we must show them our cards at all times, with both the good and the not so good news.

I ask all members on our side to join with me in remembering this commitment. We have witnessed the complacent attitude of Labor to accountability and, frankly, South Australians deserve better. South Australians largely are very tolerant and will give us the time and support to work through the problems, provided that we remember the above promise. On the other hand, as was demonstrated recently, they do not suffer fools gladly.

I turn now in this, the International Year of the Family, to Australia and the family unit. At the outset, I cannot mention this topic without challenging comments made by the member for Ross Smith during his Address in Reply contribution. In fact, I am disappointed that the honourable member is not here. Was he, during his contribution, entering an early

debate on the Bills that will be introduced later in the year? In fact, at one stage during his contribution I shut my eyes for a moment and it reminded me of the television show "Some mothers do have 'em". You get one every now and again.

Members interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHERE: And we have got one. The member for Ross Smith objected to men serving their country overseas on conscription when they were not old enough to vote. I would like to remind the honourable member that my own father and many others were in the thickest part of the fighting during the Second World War at 17 years of age and had no right to vote. But that did not worry them, because they were more interested in defending their homeland and protecting their family unit. As a result of that war, I lived and worked with a wonderful father. He suffered enormous war injuries, war neurosis and pain up until three years ago when, once again, he joined his mates from the proud Australian navy ship HMAS *Sydney*, from which he was discharged only a few days before it was sunk off the Western Australian coast.

I recount this story because my father used to believe in the Labor Party and, in fact, until 1985 always voted Labor. However, in 1985, on a day that I will never forget and of which I am extremely proud, he said to me that he was coming over to vote on my side because the Labor Party was no longer the Party he stood for during the Second World War. He claimed that economically it had lost its way in South Australia. I often wonder what my father would be thinking if he had lived long enough to witness the massive losses of 1991-92.

He was even more concerned about what members of the Labor Party were doing to the family unit. In fact, he claimed that their social justice reforms had gone too far: that they had lost their balanced approach and that the social engineering of the 1970s and 1980s was in many respects now undermining the family and community fabric that has been the backbone of Australia for 200 years. I completely agree with my father. All members in this House must now be bipartisan and, as a matter of urgency, rebuild the pride, community spirit and family unit so that we get back to some of the good old fashioned basics, and together get South Australia going again.

In this year of the centenary of women's suffrage I wish to speak about women and their role in society. First, I congratulate Joan Hall, Julie Greig, Lorraine Rosenberg, Liz Penfold and Annette Hurley on becoming members of Parliament in this historic year. I look forward to working with them. In my electorate of Mawson women are playing vital roles. Mr Richard Hicks and the Noarlunga Health Services are leading the way in many roles in South Australia, including the involvement and utilisation of women's skills.

We have wonderful volunteer groups of women working hard for our community, particularly in Woodcroft, Morphett Vale, McLaren Vale and Reynella. The Department of Family and Community Services at Noarlunga is also doing a good job and involves many women in its programs. I am not one of those who believe that women should dominate this or that group or that 50 per cent of the Parliament should be women. What I do believe in, though, is that women should be able to offer their full potential to our community and if at a given time the best people for the Parliament are made up of, say, 60 per cent women, then so be it.

Women have exceptional qualities. I should know,

because I am married to one of them. Married to one outside the House: I guess I am married to five in here! It is now time that they be given every opportunity to put all those qualities to work in our community. In fact, in recent times this has been demonstrated by the efforts of Rosslyn Brown, Vicki Chapman and Joan Young during the successful Liberal Party campaign.

In conclusion I wish to touch briefly on a number of points. The member for Ross Smith is still not here, but I will give him a copy of *Hansard* so he can read it for himself. First, with regard to the comment the honourable member made about looking after the worker, I do not know whether he has ever employed anyone, but I can assure him that many of us on the Government side have, and we value those employees. In fact, the last thing any employer wants to do is lay off loyal employees. In most instances, they would go as far as I did, to put my own wife off first rather than an employee, or even go further into debt, because employers do care about employees.

In fact, the member for Ross Smith cannot even look after the members he purported to represent, because in his previous role in the trade union movement he witnessed the loss of between 8 000 and 9 000 Public Service jobs through the Labor Government's mismanagement.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHERE: Maybe they should have. I will explain in a minute to the member for Custance why they have not. Sensible management would have been to lay off more people in middle and upper management positions, as the private sector would do in the same circumstances. That way we would have about 4 000 more rank and file employees working in the Public Service today.

Did we hear screams from them when the method of TSPs was being implemented? No. Mr Speaker, I am pleased that the member for Ross Smith has now arrived. No, we did not hear any screams from them, probably because they had done deals with the big boys. So much for their interest in protecting the rank and file! Yet now we listen to the member for Ross Smith, flexing muscle, when the best thing he could do for the workers would be to get behind us and support us in creating jobs for South Australians.

Secondly, I wish to take up the member for Ross Smith's comment about people's rights. Not once have I heard him speak about people's responsibilities. Thirdly, during his address he made some throw-away line about Dean Brown, Dale Baker and John Olsen. Let me inform the member for Ross Smith that these men are a committed part of a capable, qualified, new and strongly united team that has one goal: to return prosperity to South Australia. It is obvious that the unity problems are on the Opposition's side, and one can see that from this side of the Chamber. In fact, I guess the member for Ross Smith needs to look out, or one day he may be the Leader of the Opposition. Last, but by no means least, I wish to thank my dedicated campaign team—all 183 of them—for their tireless efforts.

An honourable member: They are all here!

Mr BROKENSHERE: A portion of them are here; the others are out campaigning. The campaign was extremely successful because of their diligent efforts and loyalty. There is a danger in singling some out, and if I forget someone in doing this I trust that they will realise that I am forever grateful to them and look forward to a long association with them all. Special thanks to my wonderful wife Mandy, my children Amie, Nick and Elissa; my mother Joy Brokenshire for a lifetime of support; my sister Julie Evans; particular

thanks to Alan Williams for a fantastic job as my campaign manager and his wife Margaret for supporting us both; John Slater; Trevor Cumpston; and Frank and Joy Kaye. I also thank the following families: the Ciesielskis, Booths, Pansinis, Ames, Gamlins, Rohrlachs, Millers, Strouts and the Butters; and to all my friends, especially all those from Mount Compass and Willunga who were supportive behind the scenes.

Thanks also to my paired electorates and Liberal members in the South-East, the Secretariat, the parliamentary staff and (after this Address in Reply) particularly *Hansard*. Thanks to my partner and all the staff in my business for their understanding and loyalty. Special thanks also to Dale Baker, Stan Evans, Peter Dunn, Bob Ritson and Dean Brown and my parliamentary colleagues. I have appreciated all your support and friendship.

In concluding, Mr Speaker, I am very honoured to be the member for Mawson. South Australia is a great State. We will start to improve in a sustainable way under the leadership of the Brown Liberal Government. I look forward to putting my agricultural and business skills to maximum use in the Parliament. I promise my constituents that I will never forget where I came from. I will continue to give the people of Mawson my undivided attention and my total commitment for the many years that I hope to represent them. Together as a team we will strive to complete our plans and goals for Mawson and the south. I look forward to working with all members of the South Australian Parliament in the best interests of all South Australians and in giving the complete service to the Mawson electorate that it justifiably deserves.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your elevation. It is a great honour for Eyre Peninsula that you have been elected to your position, and also the President in another place—another Eyre Peninsula boy, if I may be so familiar. I have also had my moments over the years and I, too, come from Eyre Peninsula. I think we have done Eyre Peninsula proud, and the people there have done us proud in turn.

Sir, before rising to speak in this debate I asked you why I was not being given an hour to speak, because this is my maiden Address in Reply in this House as a House of Assembly member, as a local member with an electorate. I was looking forward to going through the same performance as other members and thanking everybody who has assisted me over the years—and there are many of them, although some of them are long since dead (that is how long I have been around)—but you informed me that you would not be so generous as to permit that.

The SPEAKER: It is Standing Orders.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is a great pity that I do not have that time, because I think it is important that all new members, as I am in respect of this debate, have the opportunity to talk a little bit about their electorate, their background and where they come from. I would have liked to do that. It would have been a little incongruous, I must admit, because I have already announced that I will not be standing at the next election. It would have been a little odd, I concede, to go through that performance when everybody knows it is my last term.

I do congratulate all members opposite and on this side who have made their maiden speech. Whilst I must confess I have not listened to them all word for word, I have looked at some of them in *Hansard* and they all seem to have been made competently. One thing that did please me—

particularly amongst the rural members in the Parliament—is that I have some fellow Socialists; they are of the agrarian variety, but nevertheless a Socialist is a Socialist, and it is very nice to see them all here in the Parliament. I look forward to them supporting me. I will certainly be supporting them in their calls for additional subsidies and support and massive Government intervention in their particular industries, which a number of them called for. We will form an alliance against the economic rationalists—the dry sticks who sit in some of the other chairs—and I point out that none of them sits at this end of the Chamber. Before the gong, I would like—

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: With a contribution like this, I think you ought to reconsider your retirement.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: After 23 years I will leave it to others. I turn now to Her Excellency and the speech that she delivered. It was delivered superbly, as we would expect. Over the past couple of months I have been asked whether I miss not being a Minister. There are one or two things I miss—not very many, I must say. One of the things I do miss is meeting with Her Excellency at least once a week. She is an absolute delight. I do not know whether that language is disrespectful; perhaps I have not said the correct words. However, Her Excellency was an excellent choice and a superb appointment, and I do miss those weekly discussions.

[Sitting suspended from 6.1 to 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Prior to the dinner adjournment I was expressing my view on Her Excellency the Governor, how hers was an inspired appointment by the previous Government and how much pleasure she gave me in Executive Council and on other occasions when I had the pleasure to be entertained by her.

I entered this House in 1985 as the member for Whyalla, after a somewhat leisurely apprenticeship of 10 years in the Upper House, which was certainly very interesting and informative. There is not a lot of heavy lifting in the Upper House, contrary to what we go through as members of the Lower House. Nevertheless, it was quite a gentle and easy introduction to parliamentary life and one that I thoroughly enjoyed, apart from listening to some of the troglodytes on the other side. I did not enjoy some of those people at all—they had very little relevance to the twentieth century. It is a little alarming to hear some of those threads coming back in some of the speeches that have been made over the past few sitting days. It is a little disconcerting; I thought that those days had gone. However, time will tell.

My electorate, which is now called Giles, has been greatly expanded. I thought that, as do all new members in their first Address in Reply debate, I would look at Mr Giles, his contribution and what warranted my electorate being named after him. I looked in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, which contains quite a bit about Ernest Giles. He was, as all members would know, born in 1835 and died in 1897. He was an explorer who was born in Bristol in England. So, at least if they did not name the electorate after me they named it after him—we both came from the same country originally.

He followed his parents to Adelaide in 1850 and moved on to Victoria. He then started some of his exploration, and very difficult it was. He roamed further afield than my electorate, obviously, to places where the country is very tough. It is tough today and goodness knows what those people who opened up the area had to put up with. I do not like travelling through the country without the air-condition-

ing in my car going full bore, and no-one in their right mind would not do so. When one thinks of what these people tolerated to open up the country, it is amazing. It appears that the system was not that grateful to Ernest Giles, which surprised me. The *Australian Dictionary of Biography* states:

The South Australian Government granted him £250 for each of his expeditions...

I interpose by pointing out that the expeditions were long and arduous. The amount of £250, even in those days, hardly seems good and sufficient reward for what he did. It goes on:

... in 1872 and 1874 and a lease of some 2 000 square miles in the Northern Territory ... he was refused official appointment because, as Governor Jervois claimed on 11 October 1881, 'I am informed that he gambles and that his habits are not always strictly sober.'

It seems to me that that was a very churlish remark considering that this man had traipsed half way across this country and back several times on foot: because he sometimes took a drink on a hot day, he was refused official appointment. Nevertheless, I am sure that we are all grateful for not just him but others like him who opened up the country.

The electorate of Giles is the second largest electorate; it is nowhere near as large as the largest, the electorate of Eyre, which is monstrous in size. Whyalla is the largest centre of settlement, other principal places being Iron Knob, Cowell and Kimba in the rural area, and Woomera and Roxby Downs to the north, so it is a very large and diverse area. When the electoral redistribution came out, I was asked whether I would be standing for Giles and immediately I said that I would. I was asked what I thought about the redistribution, to which I replied, 'There is not much you can do about redistributions; you just wear them.'

The electorate is an excellent one. It is a wealth producing electorate; it produces a great deal of the wealth of South Australia. I also describe it as a yuppie free zone. I suggest that there is less chardonnay drunk in the electorate of Giles than in any other electorate in South Australia, and for that I am grateful. It makes me feel right at home. The rural areas are principally cereal and wool growing areas with some fishing, and we know that those areas are having to struggle. There is nothing new in that: it has always been a struggle. If you commit yourself to an enterprise in some of those marginal areas, you really have to be a special type of person to make a go of it. Unless you were fortunate in getting in early and buying the land pretty cheaply and therefore not having much debt around your neck, it will be very tough indeed.

About 10 or 11 years ago when I was Minister of Agriculture, a person who would be well known to the member for Eyre told me at Ceduna, 'If you can't exist in one good year in five in this country, you really better go somewhere else.' I thought that was pretty tough, but it has proved to be fairly accurate. World prices dictate the prosperity of those rural areas and there is little, if anything, that the families themselves or the Australian Government can do about world prices. World prices are the key.

I constantly stressed a point about inputs when I was Minister of Agriculture, and it was true to a certain extent, but now I am much older and wiser and I realise that perhaps the emphasis I put on inputs in terms of the cost of running rural properties was over-emphasised. I do not think there is a great deal to go in the reduction of inputs to primary production: I think they have gone pretty much as low as they can. We are now tinkering at the margins.

The consequence of that for primary producers is severe:

there is little they can do now to reduce their costs. There are still some things they can do, but at the margin. If world prices continue on a downward trend—they are going up at the moment but overall they are on a downward trend—it will require dramatic Government intervention to keep some of those areas viable and to keep any kind of a population in those rural areas.

Some things can be done. In her maiden speech, the member for Flinders was kind enough to mention my electorate and what was occurring in Kimba with the Sturt pea growing project. Those sorts of things must be done but, when one looks at the loss of population on the Eyre Peninsula over the past 10 years, one sees that an awful lot of Sturt pea growing projects would need to be developed to start to halt the decline. What is required on the Eyre Peninsula is not just to halt the decline but to reverse it, and the only way in which that can be done is by massive Government intervention.

Some members opposite would support me in that proposition privately but they would not say so publicly. They rail against the loss of population in rural areas, and they will not stand up and face the fact that unless there is massive Government intervention in those areas the decline in rural populations will continue. I cite one small example—the Cowell-Wallaroo Gulf Link ferry project. Again, it is not a huge project. I, as I am sure have other members of the House, have had discussions with the proponents of that proposition. They are looking for a \$5 million Government guarantee. They do not want a loan, they do not want money put up but they want a \$5 million Government guarantee. The effects of that project in the region would be significant: it would be a significant and suitable intervention by the Government.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If the member for Unley would listen instead of drivelling on, he might learn something. What has happened is that the whole atmosphere of this country over the past 10 years has been that Government intervention is wrong, that the free market is the solution to everything. I have heard and read over the past three or four days while the Address in Reply has been going on about the dynamics of the market, that the market has the answer to everything and that it will unleash business. If the world market determines that there will be 20 per cent unemployment in Australia or that the Eyre Peninsula or some other areas will be depopulated, is that all right? That is what members opposite support; that is what I have heard. That is the tripe I have been listening to for the past 10 years. That is what the member for Unley supports. I do not. I say that the market can go and get lost, and I say that within my own Party. I do not hear the member for Unley saying that within his Party. It is all about the dynamics of the market, big business and small business—'This is the way to get on.' The market is the solution to everything. Not only is it not the solution to everything but it is a large part of the problem for an awful lot of people and regions within South Australia.

I do not want the hypocrisy of people crying over the depopulation of Eyre Peninsula whilst at the same time supporting that kind of right wing rubbish. I believe that we ought to do some dramatic things such as putting up a Government guarantee for the Gulf Link ferry. It may fail, and we may do the taxpayers' dough, I concede that, but I am willing to take that chance, because if we do not—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I agree, because if we do

not do these things, we will finish up in these areas with only a handful of people, and some areas will have to close down, because there will not be the population to sustain them. It is no good crying when Lucas goes to close down your school. Unless people support some of these projects, schools will close. Woomera is in my electorate. The population of Woomera, when I came to Australia and went to Whyalla, was about 6 000. It is now just over 1 000, and I think a large percentage of those people are Americans who work at Nurrungar. The Defence Minister said that Nurrungar will be finished by the end of this century. So what do we do with Woomera? Again, unless we have some significant Government intervention—the Federal Government has put up \$30 million; the State Government has put up waffle—we should not cry when Woomera closes. Maybe nobody will, but I will. I think it is an absolute tragedy.

Going further north, just prior to the dog fence is Roxby Downs: a world class mine under world class ownership and management. It will not be without its problems. No complicated mining and engineering operation of that size will run smoothly all the time. We have to be mature enough to accept that from the outset. When things go wrong from time to time we have to look at it as a problem that is fixable and fix it rather than condemn the mine, the management or the ownership of the mine, as has happened from time to time. I think that does none of us any credit.

The largest part of the electorate is Whyalla and I want to spend my last few minutes speaking about it. I came direct from the United Kingdom to Whyalla in 1965 and I have lived there ever since. When I went to Whyalla, it was a boom town. For example, there were 6 800 steel workers at BHP, there were 1 600 shipyard workers and there were thousands of contractors who supplied both the steelworks and the shipyard. We had quite significant problems in 1965, but they were the problems of affluence, expansion and an overheated community that was desperately trying to cope with maintaining amenities and the infrastructure for the thousands and thousands of people who were brought from all over the world to build those ships and work those furnaces in the steelworks.

That changed dramatically in the late 1970s when the Fraser Government put in policies that resulted in the closure of the shipyard, together with the tremendous drop in steel prices during the 1980s and the restructuring that had to take place. It is clear that had the Federal Labor Government not been elected in 1982, steel production would no longer be occurring in Whyalla. For some reason or other, the Fraser Government and BHP did not get on. No assistance was to be given to BHP by the Fraser Government. It was a case of having to stand alone in world markets. Whatever some of the Hawke Government's later failings were, its success in industry plans was a credit to it. One of the steel industry plans was an example of significant Government intervention with the agreement and assistance of the trade unions and, of course, the company.

To cut a long and complex story short, what do we have today? From 1983, 10 years later we have a steel works that is world class and produces some of the highest quality and cheapest steel in the world. The majority of its production is now exported. The steel industry in Australia enjoys very little protection, and there is no complaint about that. The components of the steel industry plan were put in place and all the various parties over-subscribed, if possible, to their commitment to the steel industry plan.

So we have a world-class steelworks. We have some of

the cheapest and highest quality steel being produced in the world. Instead of 6 800 people producing that, there are about 2 800, and it is going down to 1 800. Instead of under 200 tonnes of output per employee per annum we have close to 600 tonnes and, of course, we have about 8 000 less people living in Whyalla. When we talk about restructuring, world competitiveness or tearing down tariff barriers, there is a consequence, and the consequence is there for all to see. Again I am very happy to say that all the people of Whyalla agreed with the process, and we now have a tremendous degree of stability in the city. We even have housing shortages and housing booms, real estate is going through the roof, and everybody is grumbling about the price of houses. That is not to suggest that there are no problems, but it shows that when unions, management and Government get together, sit down and thrash out where they want the industry to go, have a clear future for the industry and get on with it, it can be done. It is neither easy nor painless, but it can be done, and it has been done.

The electorate is very dependent on transport, particularly road transport. I am a strong supporter of the Alice Springs-Darwin rail link and, whilst agreeing completely with the right wing economic rationalists in both political Parties that it will, on their narrow definition of 'economic benefit', never pay its way, I believe it ought to be built as a nation-building exercise. Many things in this country do not pay their way. If this country were to leave itself totally to the free market, we would be exporting people, because I am not quite sure what we would produce. From time to time, even if we could produce primary products very cheaply, if the Americans and the Europeans wanted to take us on, wipe us out of our markets by dumping theirs, we could not even do that. I am not quite sure where that argument takes us.

Those of us who travel thousands of kilometres a month on our rural roads know that they are by far the best roads in Australia, and we are pleased about that. I was very pleased to hear that the Government will seal all those rural roads in South Australia in its first term of office! We look forward to the Kimba-Cleve road being sealed. Mr Speaker, you will be hearing me on some of these roads like you have never heard me before, because—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I know that there is still quite a significant rural rump here, and I know they will hold these people to account. It is now a metropolitan-based Party, as we know, but I am hoping that there are a few rural people around, agrarian socialists like myself, who will insist that these roads, whether they can be economically justified or not—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That's right; this is backbencher member for Giles, local member. So I will be looking forward to keeping this Government to its promises—and it made an awful lot of promises. It did not have to make a single promise and it would have been elected—maybe with not quite the same majority, but not far off. Whether you have 37 seats or 34 in here does not matter a damn.

I do not know what kind of Treasurer we have. Over the past two months I have been reading about all this money being poured out. Obviously, the Treasurer does not have a clue about how to control various Ministers and departments. There has been a cornucopia of promises, with all this money pouring out and everybody will be happy. When the Premier announced his debt reduction strategy a week before election

day, he said, 'It's all going to work. Cliff Walsh told me it will work.' Cliff will tell you anything if you pay him. There is a word for that, but I am sure it is unparliamentary. The Premier said, 'without any pain'. I listened to the member for Mawson this afternoon saying that there will be pain. I believe the Premier. He told me that there would be no pain and I will be keeping him to that.

In the last 30 seconds I want to refer to the Legislative Council. I spent 10 years in the Council listening to Liberal members telling me what a wonderful organisation it was and how they had a real role in reviewing Government legislation. I want our people in the Legislative Council not to go one step further than the precedents set by 100 years of Liberal members in the Legislative Council. I will be appalled if our people go one step further than those Liberals did for 100 years. I think the precedents have been set and they are quite entitled to follow exactly the same principles as those of the Liberal Party. I support the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the honourable member for Torrens I point out that even though he has already spoken in a grievance debate I regard this as a maiden speech and ask that the normal courtesies apply.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Torrens spoke for his full time in a speech in this House last week; virginity cannot be restored.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The Chair has certain discretion in these matters.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the help of the honourable member. I call the honourable member for Torrens.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Mr Speaker, as a new member of the House I had the privilege of making a maiden speech without interruption and did receive the privilege of making two maiden speeches. Can I ask for a ruling on this matter?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already given a ruling and has been particularly tolerant. I suggest to the honourable member that he look back in *Hansard* at the contribution made by the Hon. Jack Wright when he first came into the House and note the courtesies that were extended to him. I now call the honourable member for Torrens, and I will deal firmly with any frivolous points of order.

Mr TIERNAN (Torrens): Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection, although as things progress in future you will see that I do not need it. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in doing so, I commend Her Excellency on a speech that officially recognises a major turning point in the future of South Australia—a turning point which commenced on the night of 11 December 1993, heralding a change from a pessimistic attitude to an optimistic one. A Government with a positive Liberal policy was elected in South Australia; a Government led energetically by Dean Brown and his team of experienced, intelligent, enthusiastic, hard working and humanistic Ministers.

Members interjecting:

Mr TIERNAN: I am glad you appreciated that; you obviously understand. I state my loyalty to Australia, to South Australia, to the people of Torrens, to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Queen of Australia, and to our flag. Torrens is a new district, contested for the first time in 1993, compris-

ing Vale Park, Manningham, Hampstead Gardens, Klemzig, Windsor Gardens, Hillcrest, Gilles Plains, Dernancourt and the parts of Holden Hill, Hope Valley and Highbury south of Grand Junction Road, west of Valley Road and north of Lower North-East Road. The district was named after a former Premier of this State, Robert Richard Torrens, who was born in Cork, Ireland, in 1814.

His portrait is entitled to hang in this House. Robert Torrens, who came to Adelaide from Ireland in 1839, was at various times Collector of Customs, Legislative Councillor, Treasurer and Premier. He introduced the Real Property Act and resigned from Parliament to become the first Registrar-General. All other colonies adopted the Torrens title system as, eventually, did many countries throughout the world.

One's first speech is an opportunity to thank people, to express one's basic philosophy and to comment on the past and on one's hopes for the future. I thank the extremely courteous people of Torrens for their trust in me and, as I have stated in my pledge to them, which I would like to be officially recorded, I will, as my first priority, represent their interests honestly and energetically in Government, Government departments and authorities.

I wish to express my profound thanks to my wife Myra for her timely advice, counsel and support not only during the two years leading up to the election but also for the past 30 years and the next 30-odd years. I also wish to thank my sons Thomas, Sean and Mark for ensuring that I remain young in thought and in action. I thank the hard working Party supporters of the Torrens Liberal branch who worked so well throughout the past two years as a happy team. Their names are the property of our branch. Thank you also to my campaign manager Paul Anderson, my best friend for more than 34 years. Thank you to the SECs of Coles, Heysen, Finnis and North Adelaide for their direct practical support.

Thank you to the Young Liberals for their physical help. An extra word of thanks to the member for Sturt, Christopher Pyne, and his staff for their advice and moral support. Thank you to the State Electorate Secretariat, particularly Joan Young. And thank you to Jean Hook, the personal assistant to the electorate of Torrens. I was warned to expect rudeness and aggression towards me when I started campaigning, because of the adverse reputation of politicians. I did not receive any. The people of Torrens, even those who disagreed with my beliefs and expectations, were at all times polite, courteous and supportive towards me.

One of the loudest and clearest messages I received was that people desperately wanted to respect and trust their politicians. So often, particularly in the past four or five years, they have been sadly disappointed and let down by their elected representatives at all levels of Government. I say to those members of this House who have given up trying to change the public's adverse perception of us and to those who have readily accepted the *status quo* that I believe the bulk of our society is ready, willing and desperate to have a reasonable excuse to change their perception of us as a body to a positive and respectable one.

The time is right for us, both individually and collectively, to avail ourselves of this opportunity and earn the respect and confidence of our society. We certainly need to. I am sure that, with your guidance, Mr Speaker, and the positive active leadership of the new Premier and our team, this can be achieved.

Since the election of 11 December 1993 there has been a change of attitude towards us, and it is changing to a more positive one: even to both sides of the House. Also since this

election, I have received a very clear and precise message from the electorate of Torrens that Labor did not lose the election purely because of its incompetent Ministers and that the Liberals did not win only because Labor destroyed the State finances, but that the major influences that ensured we won the election were Dean Brown and his team's positive attitude towards the future, and our election promises and priorities in the areas of: rebuilding the economy and creating real jobs, particularly for our youth; our debt reduction management and plans for that management; Parliament's accountability; improved public core services; and also their expectations that we will protect and support the family unit, sadly neglected over the past few years.

Action has commenced in all these areas of priority with immediate positive results. The positive attitude of the Premier and his team of Ministers has caused commerce and industry to be more positive towards the future. Several larger and smaller firms have already increased their commitment to the economic development of South Australia, and also increased the number of people employed in Torrens. One initiative that will have a major impact on our economic development and create more jobs is the reduction of payroll tax offered to manufacturers in the export industries.

The sooner this redundant tax is removed completely, the better for all South Australians. Further reduction of this tax should be used as an incentive for industries to increase employment. Major ministerial steps have been taken already to control and account for the spending of both the Government and Government departments. Any economies achieved will be used to reduce our debt and be reallocated to where it is needed most, providing improved public services at the grass roots level of the community, in accordance with our basic Liberal philosophy.

Let me comment on the Liberal philosophy. On 6 November 1979, the member for Rocky River (John Olsen) stood in this House and said:

Central to liberalism is the belief that the liberation of enterprise, talent, initiative and their resultant diffusion through the community is an essential condition for achievement, progress and a healthy society. We want to unlock that enormous potential within mankind, not shackle it or place blinkers on it but rather give it scope, breadth and vision...

That is something I just heard of with surprise from the member for Giles.

Just to digress, another comment on our basic philosophy deserves to be mentioned. This was made by the Federal member for Sturt, Christopher Pyne, and it encapsulates the belief of the Liberal Government:

The Liberal Party is one that cares, believing in both the individual's right to work hard and gain the fruits of that labour, as well as remembering those in society who are finding the going tough and helping them through. A Party which has a social and economic development agenda...

Our Government's policies and actions are the beliefs of a Liberal Party. Also we have an excellent social agenda which is conveniently ignored by the Opposition, and sections of academia and the media. With the incompetent way that members of the past Labor Government behaved, I am convinced they must have believed that money grew on trees or that there was a pot of gold at the end of each rainbow. To listen to their questions and speeches in this House, now they are in Opposition, one would be forgiven for thinking that they also believed there were fairies at the bottom of the garden.

Just to digress, I had heard rumours in the media before I joined this House that members of some Governments asked each other Dorothy Dix questions, but I was totally surprised

to discover that the Opposition in this House are the members who ask the Government Dorothy Dix questions.

Members interjecting:

Mr TIERNAN: He has just left. The improvements in the accountability of the Parliament to the people have been activated already. Ministers have to fulfil a strict code of conduct. Also, an honest and courageous Speaker has been elected, something which was sadly lacking in your predecessor, Sir.

The parliamentary committee system will be improved. The election of the member for Gordon (Hon. Harold Allison) to the position of Chairman of Committees, coupled with the election of the member for Peake (Heini Becker) as Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee, and the member for Newland (Dorothy Kotz) as Chairperson of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee will guarantee an improvement in the Government's accountability. The only major concern I have in the area of Parliament's performance is the current Opposition's performance—that is when you are lucky to find enough in the House, but we are blessed tonight. They did such a lousy job in Government, I have little faith that they will be any good in Opposition, particularly if they continue to perform as they have in Question Time, where they have continually highlighted, by their questions, their own incompetence in Government over the State Bank, Beneficial Finance, SGIC, WorkCover, etc. Their questions reminded us how they lost the Grand Prix because of their inaction, their stupidity, or vindictiveness because they knew they would lose the election.

As a Government, we are off to a good and positive start on all fronts, and a good start is half the battle. This should be no surprise to anyone who understands or bothers to actually study our basic philosophy and not assume their own ideas of what our Party stands for. It should be no surprise if you study the breadth and depth of experiences and the qualifications of the current Liberal Government team which collectively will govern this State with honesty, confidence and enthusiasm. I wish to raise several issues and concerns I have observed and experienced.

It is important that it is officially recorded for future generations that the three major extreme philosophies preached and/or encouraged by the past South Australian Labor Government have destroyed this State's economy and finances and will never attract long-term economic development and real jobs for our children. These extreme philosophies they have preached and the hairy and fairy way in which they have attempted to apply them have not only destroyed this State's finances, but have placed extreme pressure on the very survival of the family unit, the backbone of our society. Those philosophies preached and/or encouraged by the previous Labor Government were socialism, conservatism and economic rationalism.

Socialism reduces everyone to a common denominator, depending on institutions, and attacks the family unit, particularly the extended family, which used to look after our aged. These institutions usually end up as inefficient bureaucracies, producing a pessimistic society, losing its pioneering spirit. For example, they create a society which encourages very young children to leave home rather than support families to solve their problems and stay together.

Conservatism, because of its inherent inability to resist change or the need to progress, creates an environment in which it is almost impossible for the pioneering spirit to survive. For example, as you will find in most trade unions (as the member for Norwood observed), today the unions

controlling the South Australian Labor Party have not changed their basic negative attitudes towards women for more than 30 years, though they give the issue plenty of lip service.

Economic rationalism: although application of this philosophy can produce immediate short-term results for a few, it does in the long-term create disasters for the society as a whole, particularly unemployment and the way that it adversely affects the family unit. The past Labor Government recruited economic rationalists to run the State Bank, Beneficial Finance, SGIC, etc., but lost control of them, producing fast results initially but creating disasters in the long run. The past Labor Government's economic rationalists invented teaching staffing formulas for our schools, and look at the social costs and inefficiencies this has caused in most schools, as I am sure the schools at Salisbury well realise. Economic rationalism assumes that people are, in theory, rational machines, but ignores that they are human beings with feelings, and as such their heads are often overruled by their hearts and thus they behave inconsistently. Economic rationalists are a necessary ingredient as advisers for a healthy society, as are accountants, but they should never be allowed to control the society.

For example, under a Labor Government they have given us automatic ticketing machines for our transport system, thus getting rid of conductors in the name of greater economic efficiency, but at what social cost? This change resulted in allowing the unacceptable behaviour of a few to cause loss of patronage on our public transport system, increased costs to society by increasing pollution and violence, and having to provide transport police in an effort to maintain order.

There are also automatic telephone reception systems which dehumanise our core human services. One was introduced at the Holden Hill police station by the past Labor Government's economic rationalists. Thank God for our caring and active Commissioner of Police, who as soon as he discovered its presence directed it to be replaced by a human, thus ensuring that the first contact with the public and the police are human beings and not computers.

The more we allow Labor economic rationalists and socialists to continue to dehumanise our society and attack the family the more people will feel they have been disfranchised and unwanted. They will become more frustrated, eventually giving up or becoming angry, which will lead to more and more violence. The preaching and adoption of the South Australian Labor Party's extreme philosophies of socialism, conservatism and economic rationalism has almost destroyed the pioneering spirit of South Australia and placed unacceptable pressures on the family unit. The Liberal Government will restore that pioneering spirit and support the family unit and its modern diverse make up.

Before the election and currently, the Government tackled major and minor problems on numerous fronts with an energetic and enthusiastic pioneering spirit, producing positive results and gains, which without doubt are already driving this State out of its quagmire and into a bright and prosperous future.

I refer to something that was said by the member for Rocky River (John Olsen) on 6 November 1979, because it is very appropriate in today's climate. He said:

Sir Robert often referred to Australia's pioneering spirit. In words directly attributable to the situation we face, he said:

'The truth is that, when a nation gives up pioneering, it goes back. A pioneer is quite simply one who breaks new ground or sets out on new adventures. His essence is that he is willing to tackle a new problem and has a sense of responsibility for the future.'

The Premier and his team of Ministers and the enthusiastic 18 new members, including me, are pioneers, and as pioneers we will tackle the new problems of the State's financial disasters, we will break new ground with a sense of responsibility for the future, we will provide our children and their children with a prosperous, caring society in which to live, and we will support the family unit. We can and we will.

For example, the Premier and our team advocate economic development, including improved core public services like health, education and law and order, but at the same time we will ensure ecological protection for the future. The Minister for Transport—and I am sure the member for Giles will support this—advocates incentives to attract people back to public transport and away from motor cars, which create pollution. She will succeed in the long term at little or no social cost. She should be supported by conservationists and not criticised, unlike the economic rationalists and conservationists who use punishment to obtain change, usually succeeding in the short term but not in the long term and with unacceptable social results.

The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. David Wotton) has a proactive approach to the pollution problems of the Patawalonga and the Torrens and Onkaparinga Rivers, which will give us long-term solutions, unlike the past Labor Government, which was all talk, talk, talk and no action. Maybe it thought that if it believed in it hard enough, as it did in money trees, the pollution would just disappear.

The Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education also demonstrated that this is a Government of action when, after many years of procrastination by the past Labor Government, within weeks he succeeded with the commencement of the Helpmann Academy of Visual and Performing Arts. I do not need to mention any further incompetencies of the past Labor Government: the public are now well aware of those disasters and the problems they have caused in the State's finances and in respect of health, education, transport, economy and law and order, just to mention a few.

I turn now to several issues of special interest to the electors of Torrens. These issues were raised with me when I was doorknocking and at public meetings that I conducted before the election, including a major survey covering the whole electorate. The majority of our community does not talk about economic or financial development or other jargon—jargon which I suspect is designed and used by economists and politicians to bamboozle the general public so that they do not understand what is happening to the economy until it is too late or when, like those involved in the State Bank disaster, it is too late to charge them for committing an offence.

They talk about real jobs, real jobs and more real jobs. The majority does not expect the Government to provide the jobs, but they quite rightly expect the Government to assist and support commerce and industry to keep the present jobs and to create more jobs for the future. They expect a Liberal Government to cut the red tape and to reduce or eliminate destructive and redundant taxes, like the payroll tax, which curtail or stop economic development. They expect a Liberal Government to attract new businesses from outside the State and to encourage South Australians to start new businesses, to provide relief and support to South Australian businesses, to help them export for the first time or to increase their export market. They also expect a Liberal Government to assist business to compete against the on-level playing field

outside South Australia, and to give small business the same proportional protection and support that the large multinational corporations enjoy so that they may also survive and expand.

A Liberal Government will continue to attract new business to South Australia, and we will give all businesses the appropriate support to enable them to expand. After the experience of the past 11 years, South Australian business expects nothing but an anti-business attitude from the South Australian Labor Party. Employers and suppliers of goods and services expect justice equal to that given to employees and customers in disputes in front of the commissioners, the tribunals and the courts. Currently most employers and suppliers of goods and services perceive that over the past few years the Labor Government victimised them, and they believe that with good reason. We are reviewing consumer protection issues and other related regulations, and a Liberal Government will meet community expectations in this area of need and provide equal justice to all parties involved, including industry, commerce and society as a whole.

I am excited and impressed that, everywhere I go within Torrens and other parts of South Australia, the attitude of both employers and employees has changed from a feeling of pessimism to one of optimism towards the future. The optimism that we have created is also beginning to show up in numerous local communities, such as the local police, school parents and staff associations and local church groups. I find this change in attitude since the defeat of the past Labor Government most exciting and encouraging. The positive attitude adopted and projected by our Government team, which is led by the Premier, is creating a positive economic environment in which to maintain the current real jobs and the creation of more real jobs in both the immediate and long-term future.

I say to my Liberal colleagues, the Ministers and our team Leader, the Premier, 'We are on the right track; keep it up, and faster please. Ignore the knockers, the pessimists and the South Australian Labor Party; control the economic rationalists and promote the economic humanists; support the family unit; and, most critically, continue to listen with understanding to the people of our State, particularly our youth. They are the ones who have been badly let down by their elders; and they have the most to offer for a prosperous future. Full throttle ahead and give it heaps!'

The people of Torrens will not accept that those persons who caused or allowed these financial disasters to happen, including past Labor Premiers and Ministers, should not at least be financially punished for their actions or lack of actions. Thus, on their behalf, I implore this Government to leave no stone unturned in the pursuit of these negligent people, even if it means the introduction of restrictive retrospective laws to punish them.

I have often heard and unfortunately witnessed that the law can be an ass. More than 80 per cent of the people of Torrens who responded to my survey believe that there is a deterioration in law and order in South Australia, and one of the major reasons is that there is no truth in sentencing. They have a perception that the juvenile court is one huge joke, and that joke is a cruel one on the family unit. They also perceive that our gaols are more like holiday camps instead of places of punishment and rehabilitation but that it is not the fault of our correctional services officers. They demand, as a moral right, that the police go back to a philosophy and practice that prevention is better than cure, and to achieve that there must be more police officers on patrol rather than forcing them

behind desks to do clerical work, behind speed cameras and to hide behind bushes to catch speeding motorists; and they also get lost for weeks in our court system. They perceive that our court system provides a financial incentive for practitioners of the law to procrastinate and be ponderous in both written and verbal operations, wasting our State's human resources for their own personal gain.

I am thrilled that this Government is listening to the wishes of the majority and not to the noisy, selfish minority and that it has made changes in the area of law and order and will be making even greater changes with the introduction of new Bills and regulations, including those relating to the operation of our correctional services, the treatment of prisoners and the increase of 200 operational police officers.

These changes will ensure that South Australia is, once again, a safe and just place in which to live. Due to the past Labor Government's airy-fairy philosophy towards crime and criminals, South Australia is seen as one of the best places for criminals to live. I fully agree with the member for Florey that the people of Torrens believe that a wrongdoer has had numerous opportunities to rehabilitate before being sent to gaol and that the gaol system should not only rehabilitate prisoners but also be a place of punishment.

Prisoners should work while in prison as well as avail themselves of opportunities to obtain skills and further education. They should work for a wage with a percentage going towards paying for the damage they did to our society and with a further percentage being saved for them to help them when they are released. Do members remember that lovely productive vegetable paddock outside Yatala Prison on the Grand Junction Road? That used to be tended by prisoners. Now it is non-productive and full of weeds, probably just like our gaols. When that paddock is back to full production growing vegetables again, the general public will perceive that we have regained control of our gaols.

Another issue is that people who fail to pay a fine should not be gaoled but should do double the equivalent amount of work in the community. Our enlightened hard-working Minister, the Hon. Wayne Matthew, will succeed in improving law and order in our State. Now is the time for the silent majority to stand and be counted and to support our Minister, the police, teachers and, most critically, the family unit, including the extended family where basic self-discipline is best taught and reinforced. I am sure that members will support me in supporting the family unit.

Many years ago, the Liberal Government established the Housing Trust, which successfully fulfilled its role in society, providing a good standard of well-maintained housing for those in need and those with limited financial income. A large proportion of the people of Torrens have experienced living in a trust home for their housing needs under both Liberal and Labor Government policies and practices. A swing of approximately 23 per cent of the Housing Trust population voted Liberal on 11 December 1993. It speaks for itself. My limited research indicates that the major reason for this swing was our intention to return to the original concept of the Housing Trust system, which will make it easier for tenants to buy their home, and our excellent track record in providing appropriate funds to allow the Housing Trust to operate efficiently at the service delivery point and to maintain and protect our State Housing Trust real estate assets.

Our policy of education, particularly the intention to establish the reading, writing and arithmetic skills assessment system—long overdue—was enthusiastically received by teachers, parents, TAFE lecturers and employers whom I met

before the election. Since the election many of these people have contacted me reaffirming their support for the assessment system and the whole of our education policy. This area is causing most, if not all, parents the greatest heartache and the greatest financial burden. This is the area which, as perceived, has placed the greatest fibre of our society, the family unit, under threat. I give notice to the minority groups, particularly the South Australian Institute of Teachers' executive and the Democrats, not to immorally obstruct the adoption of our education Bills so strongly supported by the people of South Australia on 11 December 1993—over 61 per cent of the vote. I will come back to the Institute of Teachers and the Democrats later in my speech.

Long overdue, exciting and dynamic changes, which I am sure the member for Giles will support, will be produced by our Government's new transport Bill. It will ensure that people will not only be provided with an excellent and comprehensive system of transport but will also want to use it, thus reducing the number of cars on the road, the need to build more roads and noise and pollution levels.

The Transport Minister's methodology for generating and achieving unanimous support for this Bill within the Government, and her consultation with all interested parties and the community in general, has been very professional and energetically carried out. The Minister is to be congratulated on her professionalism, enthusiasm and positive attitude towards this whole operation. The Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) is an excellent example of our Liberal Party's application of its policy to increase the representation of women in Government. Our women members have succeeded on their merits, not because of their gender or because of factional deals.

The O-Bahn busway—this Liberal Government initiative—is the greatest and most flexible passenger transport system in the world. Unfortunately, it has been laying dormant for too long. We need to apply some lateral thinking and Australian creativity to increase the utilisation of this system. We need to use the skills and provide the experience for our young South Australian tertiary graduates—an excellent concept, as promised by Dean Brown during the election campaign—to form teams of young graduates and commission them to create more methodologies for the application of this exciting idea of the O-Bahn. We could, for example, electrify the O-Bahn track using on the buses electric motors of a type that will use the main supply on the track and batteries when off the track, thus reducing pollution.

The Alice Springs to Darwin section of the railway will never be built if we need the assistance in any shape or form of the Federal Government, particularly while Keating is in power. The Eastern States will never allow it to happen because it is a direct financial threat to them. Thus, we must solve this problem without their assistance. My concern is that I believe the solution (that is, the Adelaide to Darwin railway line) to the problem has, over time, been seen and addressed by people as if the solution was the problem itself, and this, of course, is restricting our thinking and our actions.

The rail link is a solution, not a problem, because the solution is seen as the problem, and we naturally employ and seek consultation from railway experts to solve it when we should be utilising more generalised transport experts.

The actual problem, by the way, is to move large volumes of freight fast, efficiently and cost effectively from Adelaide to the Asian markets. The answer today may or may not be a railway link. Again, we could use a small team of South

Australian tertiary graduates to investigate and ascertain what the actual problem is now and will be for the next 50 years and then present several alternatives for the community to adopt. For example, we could build a truck O-Bahn, with vehicle operators leasing the track, and attachable steering wheels and automatic control systems coming from the Government to enable the system to be operated. What we need now is pioneering in other fields as well as medicine, drugs and computer software.

Many years ago, Mr Deputy Speaker, as you well know, during the time of a Liberal Government when I was the President of the DFE Staff Association, affiliated to the South Australian Teachers Association, the Government of the day, due to pressure from academics in the secondary schools and the CAEs, wanted to amalgamate DFE into the secondary system. I, as the President, with the support of my union members, persuaded the Liberal Government not to amalgamate but to set up a separate department and call it TAFE (Technical and Further Education), thus reflecting the true nature of its core business and to align our South Australian colleges with the other TAFE systems in Australia and overseas.

It did this, and very soon the South Australian TAFE system and its colleges became the envy of all other States and Territories in Australia. Thankfully, this Liberal Government has again reinstated TAFE as a separate department, stopping it from being consumed by a very large bureaucracy and allowing it efficiently to meet the needs of the present and future business communities. I am looking forward to working with the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. Bob Such) to ensure that South Australian TAFE will continue to develop so that all its operations can reach world standards. TAFE is a critical ingredient for the future success of this State and as such is important enough to be a separate department.

The Hon. Graham Ingerson, Minister for Industrial Affairs, is one of the best industrial Ministers I have had the pleasure to know and work with or against in my many years experience in several industries, businesses, and in several countries.

I have had experience at all levels of operation, as a worker, a union representative, president of a staff association, in junior and senior management and owner of a business. I have had direct experience both as a worker and a manager of the Labor Party's version of enterprise bargaining. The Labor Party's version—that is, union executive—of enterprise bargaining has one major flaw in its application. If a group of employees, particularly when helped by a so-called union expert after negotiating an enterprise bargain with the employer feel that they have been cheated, they have little or no redress and may have to live with that real or perceived disadvantage for some time to come, until they can convince the union expert—if they can—to renegotiate their enterprise agreement.

This problem is usually experienced by smaller groups of employees within a larger group and can be most readily and quickly resolved by the inclusion of an employee ombudsman to investigate and, if required, rectify injustices within the enterprise agreement. Our policy includes the provision of an employee ombudsman as well as the current industrial awards as the minimum standard, providing equality and justice for all parties involved. Doubtless the Labor Party regrets that it allowed unions to dictate to it not to include such employee protections in its enterprise bargaining policy but allowed union executives the sole right to represent employees in

negotiations that have disadvantaged more than 60 per cent of the workforce.

I wish to comment on another two issues. The executive of the Institute of Teachers on two recent occasions has acted as a political Party. At the last election it publicly declared that its main core business is politics. SAIT rank and file members must realise the grave risk their executive has placed on their previously excellent union; because of its turning the institute into a political Party in all but official name, the credibility of institute members as educators has deteriorated. The institute's executive has directly used members' money to pay for two recent political exercises.

In the 1993 Federal election, the executive spent tens of thousands of dollars on the 'Don't vote Liberal' campaign and used the institute's full-time paid field staff to work for Labor marginal seats. Institute rank and file members need to ask, while the executive and field staff worked on labour campaigns, who was serving the needs of members? During the 1993 South Australian State election, SAIT fielded and paid for a candidate using enormous amounts of SAIT financial and human resources to help in the campaign. Again, rank and file members need to ask who was servicing the needs of their members during that period. SAIT rank and file members need to look at the effects of the distribution of their candidates' preferences in the result of the election for the Upper House.

As parents, students and members of the Government, are we to assume that the rank and file members of SAIT are all anti-Liberal and pro-Labor, as projected by the SAIT executive? Do all the rank and file members know that a percentage of union fees are paid directly to the Labor Party, as is the case with nearly all union fees? Do those people realise that they paid towards the election campaign which gave them the past Labor Government and, as such, they are directly associated with the financial disasters of this State? Like nearly all parents, I expect that educators of our children and police officers as a body should be apolitical. The Police Association is an apolitical organisation and I commend and admire it for its professionalism.

If the two Australian Democrats in another place block the Bill to provide for voluntary voting, as they have said they will, in the face of a large mandate from the electors of South Australia, I want them to consider the following points. We live in a democracy, and we enjoy that privilege because men and women in the past have fought, as we heard earlier tonight, and some of them have died to protect that privilege.

If the Democrats block this Bill, they will be committing a sacrilege against these people by abusing democracy—the very principle their Party stands for. If they do, they should be forced to remove the word 'Democrat' from their Party's name. I know from personal contents that, should either of the Democrats in the other place vote against this Bill, their grass roots members will leave their Party and both of them will go down in history as the destroyers of the Australian Democrats in South Australia. If they vote against the Bill, I ask them both on what authority within a democracy they will be acting on, when one of them has already been rejected by the people and the other is there with a quota of less than 1—more by default than by the wish of the people. It is a disgrace that the two people, who ought to ensure that we carry out our strong, clear mandate from the people to ensure voluntary voting, have stated that they will hijack democracy, just like the terrorists who hijack planes. If they do attempt to block this Bill, I say to them, 'Shame: you will be a disgrace to your Party and yourselves.'

Just over two years ago while outside Australia I had time to reflect on our plight in South Australia. I decided to do something about it instead of complaining about the many accumulating disasters caused by the past Labor Government. I also came to a conclusion as to why such incompetent people were being allowed to continue in charge. The following statement by Edmund Burke expressed my thoughts and motivation, and I have taken the liberty of updating the language of the statement:

For evil people to succeed, all that is required is for good people to do nothing.

During the past five years a majority of South Australians in this House and throughout Government departments and community bodies, including religious groups, have said and done nothing as a body to stop these evil and incompetent people. Please do not misunderstand me: lots of good people said the right thing individually, but not enough as a body and, when they did, it was not soon enough. As we heard earlier in the House today, many years passed before something actually happened.

The result of the election on 11 December 1993 has restored my faith in good people—lots of good people. I saw over a thousand of them at a family meeting on Sunday, and they passed on a message to this Government and its Ministers: thank you for projecting and giving hope for the future. I am enjoying this job immensely. It is one of the most exciting jobs I have had, and I am looking forward with enthusiasm to many more years as a representative of the people of South Australia, particularly the people of Torrens. Mr Speaker and fellow members, the people of Torrens and my helpers, friends and supporters thank you for allowing me this opportunity to speak. You will hear more from me in the future.

Debate adjourned.

STATUTES REPEAL (INCORPORATION OF MINISTERS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

It is not possible under the Administration of Acts Act 1910 to dissolve the incorporation of the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Lands or the Treasurer because they are incorporated by Statute. The changes to the Ministry in October 1992 contemplated the dissolution of these bodies and the transfer of their assets and liabilities to the Ministers referred to in this Bill. The enactment of this Bill is the most convenient method of achieving the intended result.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act on 1 October 1992. This was the date on which the proclamation purporting to dissolve the bodies corporate referred to in the Bill was published in the *Gazette*. Section 5 of the Administration of Acts Act 1910 enables the Governor, by proclamation, to dissolve a body corporate previously established by proclamation under that section. There is no power, however, to dissolve a body corporate constituted of a Minister by an Act.

Clause 3: Repeal of Minister of Agriculture Incorporation Act 1952

Clause 4: Repeal of Minister of Lands Incorporation Act 1947

Clause 5: Repeal of Treasurer's Incorporation Act 1949
 Clauses 3, 4 and 5 make the necessary repeals and transfer the assets, rights and liabilities of the previous Ministers to the Ministers who succeeded them on 1 October 1992.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The current Administration of Acts Act 1910, ('the Act') provides a legislative mechanism for effecting variations in the administrative arrangements of Executive Government.

The Act provides that the Governor may, by proclamation, commit the administration of an Act to a Minister or confer on a Minister a Ministerial power or function. When an Act provides that a specified Minister shall hold an office, the Governor may, by proclamation, declare that the office is to be held by some other Minister. The Governor may also, by proclamation, constitute a Minister a body corporate and may dissolve such a body corporate and declare that its assets and liabilities are to become assets and liabilities of another Minister as officer. Under the Act, a Minister may also delegate any of his or her statutory powers or functions to any other Minister.

In October 1992 the Government made a number of Ministerial changes requiring the making of proclamations by the Governor. Due to time constraints at that time and a lack of a readily accessible body of information, a number of the proclamations made by the Governor were wholly or partly invalid or inappropriate. Also the provisions of the Act were found to be inadequate and to require complex proclamations to achieve simple objectives.

To address the difficulties arising at this time, members of the Offices of Premier and Cabinet, Crown Solicitor and Parliamentary Counsel met for the purpose of examining the difficulties experienced in October 1992 and putting forward proposals for the establishment of a more efficient mechanism to effect changes to Government administrative arrangements.

The working group agreed that there was a need for a comprehensive and accurate database of information detailing, among other things, the number and names of administrative units and statutory authorities and the Ministers to whom they are responsible and the Acts for which each Minister is responsible. At first, access to the database will be limited to the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Attorney-General's Department. It is anticipated that access will be extended to the wider public sector in due course and eventually to the community as a whole. It is anticipated that the Department of Premier and Cabinet will maintain the database and keep it up to date.

The need to allow for transfer of all or some of the assets, rights and liabilities of a body corporate constituted of a Minister, to the Crown or another body corporate that is an agent or instrumentality of the Crown was identified.

It was also considered that a delegation of functions and powers by a Minister to another Minister or other person should remain effective after the primary powers and functions have been transferred to another Minister, until varied or revoked.

Further, a reference in an Act, an agreement or contract or any other document to a Minister, officer or government department should be able to be read as if it were a reference to a new Minister etc as specified by the Governor by proclamation.

The Bill repeals the existing Act and includes relevant provisions from the Act as well as many of the recommendations of the working group.

It is anticipated that the Bill will allow for a more efficient, effective legislative mechanism to enable changes to the administration of government.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title
 This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Repeal

This clause repeals the Administration of Acts Act 1910.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause provides for the interpretation of terms used in the Bill.

Clause 4: Alteration of title of ministerial office

Clause 4 provides for the alteration of the title of a ministerial office by proclamation. To change the title of a Minister at the moment it is necessary for the Minister to resign and then to be appointed by the Governor under the new title.

Clause 5: Committal of Act to Minister

This clause provides for the committal of the administration of an Act to a Minister.

Clause 6: Conferral of ministerial functions and powers

Clause 6 provides for the conferral of ministerial functions and powers on a Minister. Clauses 5 and 6 reflect the substance of section 3(1) of the Administration of Acts Act 1910 repealed by clause 2.

Clause 7: Body corporate constituted of Minister

This clause provides for incorporation of a Minister. The incorporation of a Minister facilitates the holding of property such as land by the Minister. Subclause (2) provides that a Minister will be incorporated in respect of all of his or her functions or powers unless specifically limited by the proclamation.

Clause 8: Interpretative provision

This clause is a provision that enables the Governor to direct a reference in an Act or other instrument or document referred to in subclause (1) to a Minister, a Public Service employee or an administrative unit to have effect as if it were a reference to another Minister, Public Service employee or administrative unit. Public Service employees are all the persons employed by or on behalf of the Crown except for those referred to in schedule 2 of the Government Management and Employment Act 1985. That schedule excludes (amongst others) the judiciary, the Auditor-General, the Ombudsman, the Police Complaints Authority and the Electoral Commissioner and Deputy Electoral Commissioner.

Clause 9: Delegation of functions and powers by a Minister

This clause provides for delegation of functions and powers by a Minister. It is similar to section 6 of the Administration of Acts Act 1910. Subclauses (4) and (5) are new. They provide for the continuity of delegations, appointments and authorisations on the transfer of the relevant function or power from one Minister to another.

Clause 10: Evidentiary provision

This clause is an evidentiary provision and is similar to section 7 of the Administration of Acts Act 1910.

Clause 11: Proclamations

Clause 11 provides in subclause (1) that a proclamation has effect notwithstanding an Act or law to the contrary. An Act may, however, expressly exclude the operation of that subclause.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 183.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I rise to endorse the Address in Reply. As an Australian citizen, I reaffirm my loyalty to Queen Elizabeth II. Our Queen has been faithful to her coronation oath. She has upheld the values that the monarchy ought to defend and fulfilled her duties in a manner that even a Jacobite, such as I, can admire. I have yet to read a sensible or fair-minded criticism of her reign. Our oaths and affirmations of loyalty are to the Queen and to her heirs and successors according to law.

I am amused how indignant elderly Liberal voters become about Paul Keating's quest for an Australian republic. Australia will become a republic only if Australians vote to change our Constitution according to the provisions of the Constitution; that is, according to law. To listen to these indignant Liberals, one would think that the Prime Minister was plotting a revolution—he is not—and that the House of

Windsor itself did not rest on a foundation of revolution and breach of oath—it does.

Queen Elizabeth's usurping ancestors added the phrase 'according to law' to the oath so that Parliament could reserve to itself the power to change the royal family, as it did in 1688 and again by the iniquitous Act of Settlement of 1700. The Act of Settlement excludes Catholics from the succession and prohibits an heir marrying a Catholic. I hope that when I next take the affirmation the phrase 'according to law' does not embrace the Act of Settlement. I do not understand why the Act of Settlement could not be amended by this Parliament in so far as it applies to the Crown in right of South Australia.

I congratulate Mr Speaker on his appointment to high office. I know that he will defend the privileges and Standing Orders of the House, as his independent predecessor did. I assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that I shall cooperate in the proper dispatch of business.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Standing Order 121 refers to irreverent, offensive or unbecoming words in reference to the Sovereign. I believe that the member for Spence has alleged that the Sovereign has, by several acts of history, unrightfully gained the throne. I think that is unbecoming language to be used in this House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has his point of view. I listened very carefully and with interest to the comments of the member for Spence. I did not detect any suggestion of irreverence, but more a statement of history. With that in mind, I do not believe there is any point of order to be sustained. The member for Spence.

Mr ATKINSON: Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker—a wise ruling. I mourn the passing of the Hon. John Burdett. I enjoyed his company, his courtesy and his wit. He was a mentor to me. As a Christian parliamentarian, he was an example to us all of how the faith and the member of Parliament's vocation can be reconciled. On opening day, the Premier mentioned that when the Hon. John Burdett was Minister of Community Welfare he celebrated Christmas lunch with imprisoned youth at one of the training centres. What I should add is that the Hon. John Burdett did not tell the media about his deed; it was done for its own sake.

I congratulate the Premier and the Liberal Party on their smashing victory in the general election. The new Government has strong public support but a surprisingly narrow mandate. Before the election, I had thought that a Liberal Government would give the highest priority to reducing the State debt of almost \$8 000 million. South Australians would have been well-served by a Liberal Party that put an austerity program before an electorate weary of Labor and eager for change—any change. The Liberal Party would have won such an election with a working majority and a mandate for that austerity program.

Alas the Liberal Party did not put an austerity program before voters. In the name of small 'l' liberalism—whatever that is—the Liberal Party promised increased Government expenditure on education, health, police and sport, to name just a few areas. It avoided the hard topics. Under the now Premier's leadership, the Liberal Party was all things to all people. The Liberal's election strategy of raising expectations can be read in its policy documents lodged in the Parliamentary Library and in Her Excellency's speech. Accordingly, the Liberal Party won 37 out of 47 seats in the House of Assembly.

The Premier now has backbenchers he never wanted, such as the member for Lee. His Party represents districts that

must be the victims of his budgets and, worst of all, he has a mandate so attenuated as to be worthless in his major task, which is reducing State debt. This contradiction will dog the Brown Government until the next election. No doubt the Federal wets, such as Senator Vanstone and ex-Senator Puplick, are crowing that the so-called moderate Liberal strategy is the path to success.

Mr CAUDELL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I refer to Standing Order 125 which deals with offensive words against other members: the member for Spence used derogatory language towards the member for Lee, and he should withdraw the remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been listening very carefully to all members, and I did not detect anything abusive and unparliamentary in the honourable member's comments, though I have no doubt that individual members may take personal exception. However, since the member for Lee is not here to defend himself, I do not believe there is a point of order in this case.

Mr ATKINSON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. So Vanstone and Puplick may be crowing that the so-called moderate Liberal strategy is the path to electoral success, but the Federal Parliamentary Liberal Party would be well-advised to ignore their gloating. Many times in the next four years this Government will need the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Primary Industries to give it the guts that the wets do not have. Of that \$8 000 million of debt, almost \$5 000 million was caused by the State spending more on education, health and other services than it was able to raise by taxation or Commonwealth grants. This over-spending pre-dates the Bannon era.

As a Government backbencher in the last Parliament, I used to wince when I heard Ministers assert that, in their department or portfolio, South Australia had the best services in the country or that South Australia spent more in such and such an area than any other State. I wondered how a small State, with a population and economy growing more slowly than that of other States, could manage the standard of services about which Ministers boasted. Having the highest paid teachers and public servants in the country was never going to save the State Labor Government.

We were defeated because the State Bank, the State Government Insurance Commission and the Timber Corporation lost about \$3 500 million. It serves no purpose for the Labor party to quibble about who or what was to blame. We were in office when it happened; it happened on our watch. That is all the voters want to know. Even if the Jacobs' Royal Commission had exonerated Premier Bannon, voters in Spence to whom I spoke would not have been interested in the report. Like most Labor leaders and rank-and-file ALP members, John Bannon was mildly utopian. Like Dunstan before him, he wanted to get hold of the levers of Government and work them to the benefit of our constituency. He wanted Government to do things, and to do things they needed money.

Instructed by the Labor platform, John Bannon sought to increase expenditure on hospitals, schools, public housing, public transport and a better environment, just to name a few. He needed more revenue but the Federal Treasurer, Paul Keating, was hostile to the States, whoever ruled them, and the States had to bear the brunt of the Federal Government's determination to reduce the public sector's share of gross national product. John Bannon turned to the State Bank and SGIC to obtain the revenue he needed for Labor's program. The men in charge of the State Bank and SGIC told him that

they could enter the deregulated financial market and win big profits for the State. He trusted them. The Cabinet trusted the Premier in his own portfolio. Members of the Parliamentary Labor Party were reluctant to countenance rumours about the bank, when, within living memory, rumours about financial institutions had, by themselves, caused collapse or near collapse of these institutions. Banks are based on confidence.

During the third Bannon Government we learned that the Premier's trust had been misplaced. We were to discover that more than \$3 000 million had been lost. Labor's mild utopianism became a nightmare. Hospitals, schools, public housing, public transport and the environment would suffer, not benefit. In a preface to Mr Chris Kenny's book *State of Denial* the Federal Labor member for Makin, Mr Peter Duncan, who was a rebellious backbencher in the first Bannon Government, railed at the Bannon era. It is as if the disaster could have been avoided if Mr Duncan had been leader instead of Mr Bannon. Perhaps it could have been avoided, but it would have been by luck rather than design if it had.

Mr Duncan founded the socialist left faction of the ALP in 1979. He believes in the socialisation of the means of production and exchange. He believes that the more enterprises that are brought under State ownership and control, the more we can eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features of the market or capitalist economy. Mr Duncan's political opinions have a long tradition in the Australian Labor party and it is his right to hold the views he does.

If Mr Peter Duncan had been Premier of South Australia—and his faction was one-third of Cabinet from 1988 to the end—the State Bank, SGIC and the Timber Corporation would have been bigger and more ambitious for revenue than they were. Under Mr Duncan there would have been other State enterprises trying to do what the State Bank, SGIC and the Timber Corporation did.

It was the rank and file of the party in convention assembled which believed that poverty, crime, unemployment, disablement, racial tension and sickness could be abolished by increased Government funding and by legislation. Year after year the hundreds of agenda items at State ALP convention called for increased Government spending on almost everything. One year—I think it was 1984 when I was reporting State ALP convention for the *Advertiser*—the Elizabeth ALP sub-branch moved a motion for a waste-watch committee or an audit of State Government spending that might prevent waste. As soon as it was moved the weight of the Government and Party came down on the Elizabeth sub-branch. A ministerial staffer, soon to be an MP, spoke against the proposal: 'No waste in the Labor Government, comrade!' The item was the only one lost the whole weekend.

It was the Party that drove John Bannon to schemes that would increase the revenue of the State. We would have driven Peter Duncan or any other leader the same way. What worries me is that the dominant wet faction of the Liberal Government seems to equate Government spending with happiness the same way that the Labor Party has. Never again should a Labor Government borrow money to fund recurrent spending. I am a Labor man, but I am a pay-as-you-go Labor man.

If the Hon. Kym Mayes had not retained Unley at the 1989 general election, the Minister of Infrastructure, as he now is, would have become Premier. It would have been he who announced the State Bank losses in early 1991 or, on the kindest interpretation, the second half of 1990. It is he who would have fronted the Jacobs royal commission, along with

Mr Bannon. Political responsibility would have been muddled.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: I am. After all, the Liberal Party joined the *Advertiser* in supporting the State Bank's loan to Myer Remm, and that loan is now the State Bank's biggest single loss. Joy Nimon, where were you when the Labor Party needed you? I still regard John Bannon as having a fine mind, great parliamentary skills and the necessary strong will for leadership. We were right to make him our Leader in 1979. He failed in a way that none of us could have foreseen. The South Australian branch of the ALP will now have to live with its failure. Unless we adopt policies that mean that South Australians can trust us with money, we will never grace the Treasury benches again.

I have listened to the maiden speeches of 11 new Government members. The member for Flinders spoke for almost a hour. Her speech was a survey of her electorate as, indeed, were many of the maiden speeches. I agree with her point that lack of understanding between city and country people is unfortunate, although do I not think combining the city and country editions of the *Advertiser* will help overcome it, as she suggests. The member for Flinders' maiden speech climaxed with a quote she attributed to Abraham Lincoln. It began:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

She quoted five other maxims in this vein, saying that she had carried these quotes of Abraham Lincoln with her for many years.

Mr Brindal: But you checked it up, didn't you?

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, I did. Alas, I must tell the member for Flinders that Abraham Lincoln's biographers have not been able to find this quote in any of Honest Abe's works or on the public record. The reason they cannot find this quote is that it was written in 1916, long after Lincoln died, by a Pennsylvania clergyman, the Reverend William Boetcher. The quote has been attributed to Lincoln because of a pamphlet issued in 1944 arguing for legal barriers to prevent the then American President Franklin Roosevelt seeking another term.

One of the pamphlet's headings was 'Lincoln on limitations'. On the back of the pamphlet was the quote the member for Flinders used. Some of the readers of the pamphlet thought that these words were also Abraham Lincoln's: they were not. Perhaps it was the intention of the pamphlet's authors that the quote would be so taken by readers. We shall never know.

Mr Quirke: Lincoln would have said it if he'd lived long enough.

Mr ATKINSON: As my colleague the member for Playford said, if Honest Abe had lived long enough he might have said it. And he might. The member for Flinders is not the first member of the House to attribute the words to Abe Lincoln. The Minister for Infrastructure and the members for Goyder and Newland have made the same mistake, and on each occasion they were corrected by that martinet, the Hon. John Trainer. I am indebted to the Hon. John Trainer for his file on this matter. Although the member for Flinders believes the words to be true and that they show great insight into society and the economy, the words are not Abraham Lincoln's, and I do not think the member for Flinders would have quoted the words had she known they were the work of a little-known Pennsylvania clergyman.

Losing his direction in Parliament House was something to which the member for Hanson confessed early in his speech. He followed up with a second and unintended example of poor sense of direction when he said:

The overall statewide swing was tremendous, to say the least, and meant, of course, that all the western suburbs—all of them—some of which were regarded as heartland Labor seats, became Liberal. My electorate, Spence, is and always has been in the western suburbs. The Town of Hindmarsh, together with West Croydon, Woodville and Findon, which are the principal districts in the electorate I have the honour to represent, are all western suburbs. I retained the seat of Spence for Labor with a swing against me of less than half of what the Liberals required to win the seat, and well below the State average. Labor won all booths situated in Spence.

Mr Brindal: Yes, but you're a Liberal member sitting on that side of the House!

Mr ATKINSON: I'm not a Liberal, mate. This is not the only howler by the member for Hanson. Today in grievances the member for Hanson told us that the Labor Party was capsized, decimated and electrocuted at the election. To 'decimate' is to reduce by one-tenth. If only my Party had been decimated at the 11 December election, we could have coped quite happily with a loss of two or three seats. I do agree with the member for Hanson's remarks about family life in his maiden speech, but was puzzled by his quoting, with approval, President Kennedy's remark 'All man's problems are created by man and can be solved by man.' I find this sentiment brazenly humanistic, and odd coming as it does from a member who described himself as an ordained Christian minister of religion. I was, however, pleased to hear him quote at length my old grammar teacher, Mr Dudley Burton.

Staying with the western suburbs, I was surprised to hear the member for Colton say that 'the electorate of Colton takes in part of Findon'. I am sorry to tell the member for Colton that all of Findon is in Spence. Not so much as a street or a cul-de-sac is in Colton. I am pleased to tell him that both Findon booths supported Labor. If the member for Colton needs a native guide in the western suburbs to help him find his way from his Tusmore fastness, I am that man.

The member for Colton told us that a city must be the centre of activity, and that we ought to have substantial residential population living in and around the fringes of the central business district. I find this statement in his maiden speech hard to reconcile with his campaign as Lord Mayor to close Barton Road, North Adelaide, to people living in Ovingham, Bowden and Brompton. How are these people supposed to get to the centre of activity?

Mr Brindal: Is it still closed?

Mr ATKINSON: You can drive through it. The member for Colton wrote to one North Adelaide resident who complained about the closure to say he thought western suburbanites should not worry about 'driving a few extra kilometres' to get to North Adelaide and the central business district.

The member for Hartley opened by congratulating Her Excellency on her memorable speech. If he thinks it was so memorable, perhaps he will agree to my examining him on it *viva voce* in 12 months' time. His praise for the virtues of single member electorates was, however, pertinent, and I hope he never forgets these virtues.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: One of my constituents, Mr Glenn Jarvis, of Woodville South, wrote a fine speech. It was delivered in this House by the member for Lee who, alas, was not equal to pronouncing many of the words. The member for Lee has stood for public office many times. He stood for the Upper House as head of the Majority Wishes Party, for General Secretary of the Public Service Association, for Findon ward of Woodville council, for West Croydon ward of Woodville council, and for Albert Park ward of Woodville council. This is only a fraction of the member for Lee's unsuccessful candidatures. In the Albert Park ward poll, which was for a single vacancy, he stood against his wife Annette. Mrs Rossi out-pollled him convincingly, but neither won the seat. On 11 December 1993—

Mr CAUDELL: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I appreciate that the member for Lee is not in the Chamber, but I do find that the words are offensive against the member for Lee and ask that the member for Spence apologise for those particular words.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has not raised a point of order. The member for Spence claims that he is quoting once again historical fact. As such, it should be refuted by the member for Lee if it is incorrect. The honourable member is not in the Chamber; I cannot uphold the point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. On 11 December 1993 the member for Lee was finally successful, and it is nice to see a former member of the Spence ALP sub-branch succeed. I was taken by Mr Jarvis's remark that 'there is nothing so miserable as a socialist'. At one time, when the member for Giles was younger, socialism was a doctrine. It meant something. A person who described himself as a socialist was making a strong moral choice. In the aftermath of socialism's overthrow in central and eastern Europe, socialism is no longer a doctrine. It is in danger of becoming merely a neurosis. It seems to me that the young socialists today are not socialists because they have an alternative policy for Australia but because they hate their father, hate their independent school or hate their culture.

Bearing this in mind, I relished the member for Norwood's maiden speech because, like the member for Lee, he is a former member of the ALP. In an article entitled 'Confessions of a political maverick' published in the *Adelaide Review* on election eve, the member for Norwood wrote:

Why do I now support the Liberal Party and not, say, the Democrats? In answer to the question one could observe that the Liberal Party is left of the Labor right and more in line with the Labor centre left.

Do you agree with that, Mr Deputy Speaker? The member for Ridley will be surprised to hear that he is a member of a Party in line with the Labor centre left. The member for Norwood is covering his tracks here. Left and right do not mean much any more and, in the mouth of the member for Norwood, they mean even less.

In this Parliament the member for Norwood will vote to strip employees of many of their rights to workers compensation, he will vote to ensure that 15 and 16 year old shop assistants and fast-food workers are not represented by a union and he will vote to deny indigenous Australians their rights established by the High Court in the Mabo case. I know a phoney when I hear one.

Mr BRINDAL: Is it not incorrect, according to Standing Orders, to anticipate the vote of members or to try to intimidate members in their vote? That is distinctly what I heard the member do. I ask him to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am listening very carefully to the honourable member. He may have been sailing closer to the wind in attributing improper motives, but the honourable member did not raise that point of order. I do not believe that the member did raise a point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: A good call, Sir. When the member for Norwood was in the ALP in the 1970s and the early 1980s he was a militant and pure socialist. Everyone who wanted to be preselected pretended to be more left than the next comrade because the left unions had the numbers. At that time, it was Labor policy to grant *de jure* recognition to the Soviet Union's annexation of Lithuania. The member for Norwood did not join those of us on the right of the Party who spoke up for Lithuania and the other captive nations, yet last Friday night the member for Norwood proposed the toast to Lithuanian independence at Lithuanian House, Norwood. The member for Norwood is a man of fashions.

My ears pricked when I heard the member for Norwood in his maiden speech thank the Greek community of the Church of the Prophet Elias. During the campaign the member for Norwood refused to answer questions put to all candidates by the Festival of Light. These questions were on prayers in Parliament, abortion, prostitution, euthanasia, pornography and the status of marriage. I look forward to letting the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese know the member for Norwood's voting records on these and like matters. I suspect his values and those of Orthodox Christians are as chalk and cheese. For one reason or another we will not hear the member for Norwood misusing the name of the Prophet Elias again in a post-election Address in Reply.

I was impressed by the member for Light's speech. I think he may become dux of the class of '93. He is headed for higher office. One story in his maiden speech, though, puzzled me. When the man after whom his seat was named came to Deadman's Pass in 1839 and there found a man's skeleton in a tree, how did he at once know, as the member for Light tells us, that it was that of a white man?

The member for Reynell drew on the election campaign slogans for her maiden speech. She told us South Australians were the victims of Labor's failures and these failures were: 8 000 people on the waiting list for elective surgery at public hospitals; 1 200 fewer teachers; the elderly at risk of breaks; and 43 000 people on the Housing Trust waiting list. The member for Reynell also moaned about inadequate public transport. I am eager to apply these tests to the Government of which the member for Reynell is a supporter. I do hope she will not object to my condemning the Government in four years' time if there are still people on the waiting list for elective surgery at public hospitals and for Housing Trust homes, or if we have fewer teachers employed than we do now and if (perish the thought) the elderly or any householder is at risk of having their home burgled.

The member for Reynell's ardent certainty might be tempered if she reflected on this statement last year by the shadow Home Secretary in the House of Commons, Mr Tony Blair:

It is a cliché, but true nonetheless, that it is the people who live on inner-city estates or use public transport—many of them Labour voters—who suffer most. Many of these people feel disenfranchised after 14 years of Tory neglect of inner-city crime.

Those of my constituents who are weary of crime in our area should expect nothing from the Hall-Brown Wets and the dreary left-liberals such as the member for Norwood. My constituents do not ignore the social context of crime, but

they will not listen to the sociological hand-wringing of the members for Norwood and Coles.

I would never have thought that that working class conservative—that Alf Garnett of the north-eastern suburbs, the member for Florey—would join the Hall faction, but he has. I agree with the remarks he made in his maiden speech about prisons being a place of punishment as well as rehabilitation and about the need for a clearly defined system of behaviour management. I do not know how the member for Florey will get his law and order policy past the bleeding-heart, left-liberals who dominate the Government. The member for Florey and I share some of the City of Enfield, whose Mayor is Mike Stock—not, let me assure the honourable member, David Stock, as he called him in his maiden speech.

The member for Elder, another flower child and former candidate for a political Party other than the Liberal Party—on this occasion the Australian Democrats—told us that Her Excellency's speech was an inspiration to all South Australians. I do not think that one-tenth of one per cent of South Australians will read Her Excellency's speech, let alone be inspired by it; and I doubt whether Her Excellency was inspired by it. That is a reflection on its author, not Her Excellency. The member for Elder quoted crime statistics at length. I do hope he will be good enough to quote the same statistics in 1997 and accept the political consequences of his current cheap political rhetoric.

It seems that the member for Mitchell is another left-liberal who is a captive of the political correctness movement. He referred to himself in his maiden speech as a 'small business person'—he looks like a man to me. At least the honourable member had the humility to acknowledge that he was elected to the House not because of his personal popularity but because he was the Liberal candidate. He said that his future in the House was tied to the success of the Brown Government's program. I wish he would hose down the egos of the members for Norwood and Coles, who think they are free-standing political successes.

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): First, I would like to congratulate you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and the Speaker on your election to office.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Well, I still call him the member for Bragg; that is the way I always remember him. I support the motion before the House and congratulate Her Excellency on her speech and the leadership that her Government will be providing to South Australia and South Australians. At last, action will be taken to get this State back on its feet. I will refer to specific sections of the Governor's speech shortly. However, before I do that I would like to indicate how delighted I am to have been returned to this House as the member for Wright and, just as I did in 1979, I acknowledge that in 1993 this was because of the actions of the Government of the day. However, I also indicate that in 1982 I was very proud to be returned to this House with a swing against me of less than two per cent when the seat to the north of me had a swing of 14 per cent and the seat to the south had a swing of 10 per cent. I certainly intend to repeat that performance now that I am back in this House.

I intend to work for the electorate and the people, just as I did between 1979 and 1985. As members who were present at that time would realise, in 1985 the seat that I stood for was carved up into three equal parts, which made it extremely difficult to retain for the Liberal Party. However, the period

during which I have been out of the House—eight years—I believe has been of tremendous benefit to me. I have been able to get back into ‘the real world’. During those eight years I was heavily involved in industrial relations, where I had the fortune to be the group human resources manager for some key employers in this State.

During those eight years I saw at first hand the impact that the previous Government had on this State. As I said, I look forward to the next couple of sessions, at least, in terms of working with this Government to try to turn around the problems that have been created in this State during the past 11 years of Labor Government. I might say that I certainly intend to stay, despite the gratuitous comments that the member for Ross Smith made about the class of ‘93 and other newly elected members on this side of the House. I indicate to the class of ‘93 that, during the period 1979 to 1982, if I had been given a dollar every time I was told I was a ‘oncer’ I would have been able to retire in 1982.

A point was made very well by one of the speakers on our side of the House earlier today and it was that, if these people who have been elected to the Parliament now work and work well, they will be rewarded because their electorate will recognise that effort. I have every confidence that they will be returned after the next election. The member for Ross Smith also led with his chin when he stated that he was certain that he and the rest of his ilk would be back after the next election because they had reached their nadir—they could go no lower. He said that they would be back but that many of us on this side would not.

I point out to the member for Ross Smith, in case he has not seen it, the A.G.B. McNair poll that was released a few days ago. I think even he would acknowledge that that is a poll that very rarely shows the full support of the Liberal Party because it does not poll the rural areas. The *Bulletin* of 22 February carried the headline ‘Brown’s huge lead’. Despite the fact that the member for Ross Smith said we could do no better, it showed the Liberals polling 2.1 per cent better than they did at the time of the election in December 1993. That means that the member for Ross Smith and a couple of other members opposite would not be here if the election had been held this year. So, the Labor party has not yet reached its nadir, and if it continues to perform as it has in Question Time I doubt that following the next election it will have any members returned: we will have a situation similar to that which occurred in Canada, and the Labor party will be completely wiped out.

So, to the class of ‘93 I say, ‘Keep your head down; do not listen to the garbage from the other side; and, if you work and work your electorates well, every one of you will be back, and we will have some new colleagues as well.’

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I was returned in 1982; I was delighted to be returned in 1982. Obviously the member was not listening. In 1985 the electorate of Todd was carved into three equal areas. I was not able to stand for my electorate, and even then I lost by only 200 votes.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I thank the Minister for his comment. Obviously the honourable member was not listening, so I repeat: in 1982 the seat to the north of me returned a 14 per cent swing against the Liberal Party; the seat to the south of me returned a 10 per cent swing against the Liberals; and the swing against me was less than two per cent. We were all Liberal members. I will just leave it there. I look forward to coming back for the next session and determining when I will

retire from the Parliament. I repeat: ‘Do not listen to them, class of ‘93. Work and you will be back along with some new colleagues on our side of the House.’

I would like to commend my opponent on her hard work and the high level of recognition which she established within the electorate of Wright. The research shows that she had the highest recognition of any candidate in the 1993 election. For that I commend her, because she worked extremely hard for two years within the electorate of Wright and she was an extremely competent opponent.

However, having said that I must now make some comment in relation to the campaign that was waged by the Labor Party against me in Wright. I have never before, whether it was in 1979, 1982 or 1985, seen such a campaign of vilification and falsehoods, as was levelled against me in particular and the now Government in general, as that which occurred during this election. I would like to point out to the Opposition the effect of some of the things it did on innocent people within the electorate of Wright. First, a letter was sent to every person who had a Housing Trust home within the electorate of Wright. That letter stated, ‘If you return a Liberal Government you will be thrown out of your home.’ That is exactly what it said: ‘You will not have a home.’

Members opposite might think that is politics, but I had an 82 year old woman telephone me in tears because of that letter. She said, ‘Mr Ashenden I have voted Liberal all my life; if I vote for you I am going to lose my home. What do I do?’ I hope members opposite appreciate the impact of their letters and scare campaign. I know all they wanted to do was to get a Labor member for Wright, and they totally ignored the impact that it had on people like that 82 year old woman. I hope members opposite do not think that this is funny, because it is deadly serious. That lady was distraught.

A doctor in my electorate rang me after this letter had been sent out and said that three distraught senior citizens had come to see him. He wanted to know whether it was true. I had to reassure him that, of course, it was not true, so the innocent were the victims of this campaign. All the Labor Party wanted was power. Why did they have to send out letters that had that sort of an impact on the people who were least able to understand and defend themselves?

A second statement was made. It is well known that I was a councillor for the City of Tea Tree Gully for five years prior to my election to this House. During that period, one of the things of which I was most proud was that I was able—and I do not mind taking all the credit, particularly for the initial stages—to keep rates in Tea Tree Gully at or below the inflation rate. What did my opponent do but write a letter and distribute it throughout the suburbs of Wynn Vale and Golden Grove saying that if Scott Ashenden was elected to Parliament rates would go up by 10 times. That is the sort of nonsense that was put forward.

Another letter was sent out just two days before the election to parents at one of the schools at my electorate saying, ‘If you elect a Liberal Government your school will be’—not may be or might be—‘closed.’ So, what happens? I have distraught parents ringing me on behalf of their children.

Mrs Rosenberg: What about the effect on the kids?

Mr ASHENDEN: And of course, the effect on the children themselves.

An honourable member: They have no morals, have they?

Mr ASHENDEN: Exactly. I have never been subjected to the sort of vicious, personal smear campaign that was set

in action throughout the electorate of Wright. It is something I hope I will never run into again, and I assure members of this House that in no way did I respond in kind. I campaigned on what a Liberal Government and I would do, and I left the dirt and smear tactics to the other side.

The Democrats continually preach that theirs is the Party of the environment. I suggest that people drive through the electorate of Wright and look at the posts on which the Labor Party, the Liberal Party and the Democrats attached their posters. Before midday on the Sunday after the election, not one Liberal poster was left up; within two days not one Labor poster was left up; but in the electorate of Wright the Democrats' posters are still there. I just make the point that if this is the Party of the environment it is a funny way to represent the environment.

I would now like to brief the House on the electorate of Wright. As members would know, Wright is a completely new seat. It covers an area of 52 square kilometres and is an extremely rapidly growing electorate which includes the suburbs of Fairview Park, Yatala Vale, Surrey Downs, Wynn Vale, Golden Grove, Greenwith and Salisbury East as well as a rural portion which includes parts of One Tree Hill and Upper Hermitage. I will have to have a little shot at the Electoral Commission because it made a mistake on the boundary between Newland and Wright. It is just as well that the election did not hinge on fewer than 30 votes, because 30 people who should have been included in the electorate of Wright were included in the electorate of Newland. However, I fully understand the difficulty the Electoral Commission had in determining where the boundaries in Upper Hermitage are.

The electorate obtained its name from Edmund Wright, who lived from 1824 to 1888. He was a famous architect who played a major part in the design of many of the early buildings of Adelaide: for example, the Adelaide Town Hall and Edmund Wright House in King William Street. He also assisted in designing the Victorian Parliament House in Melbourne. Edmund Wright was a Mayor of Adelaide and is recognised by many as Adelaide's most eminent nineteenth century architect, who had a major influence on the classical revival style of architecture in Adelaide.

The electorate of Wright is a dormitory electorate. There is a lack of job opportunities and it is virtually entirely a residential area. There is very little industry. There is some retail trade, but generally speaking it is an area to which residents commute each evening after undertaking their work elsewhere.

Many of them work in Salisbury and Elizabeth and, of course, a large number work in the city of Adelaide. We are fortunate in the electorate of Wright to have as a major part of that electorate the Golden Grove Development. That development is currently 10 years old and is considered by many as one of Australia's leading areas of urban development. When the project is completed there will be 9 820 dwelling sites, occupying 1 260 hectares of land, with an estimated population of 28 000 people. Currently, 6 963 dwelling sites have been sold, 6 433 homes approved for construction, 5 283 homes completed and a population of approximately 14 800.

Key features in the Golden Grove Development have been the innovations in housing. I refer, for example, to villas, two-storey villas, medium density housing and innovations in allotment size. There are traditional allotments, premium traditional allotments (comprising about 1 200 square metres), as well as courtyard and villa allotments. Golden

Grove has seen density levels rise from nine dwellings per hectare to 17 dwellings per hectare. An average of 14 dwellings per hectare is currently being achieved. By the end of the project this will have increased to about 16 to 17 dwellings per hectare. The whole area has been coordinated, structured and planned and, as a result of the development, a large number of new families have moved into the area.

Golden Grove offers a wide range of primary and secondary education facilities. In fact, I do not think there would be another electorate that would come within a very great distance of the electorate of Wright in that my electorate has 22 schools. When I was the member for Todd, I established a very close relationship with all the schools in my electorate. I certainly intend to do that again, but I have never before, as a member of Parliament, represented 22 schools. The majority of those schools are in the Golden Grove Development: one in Fairview Park, one in Surrey Downs and five in Salisbury East, with the remainder being within the Golden Grove Development. We have approximately 2 400 students attending secondary schools and 2 700 attending primary schools in the Golden Grove Development.

Something which I find quite remarkable is that 55 per cent of the children attending schools in the Golden Grove area are attending private schools. Again, I do not think there would be any other area anywhere in the State which would have more than half its children attending private schools. Another feature of the schools in Golden Grove is that they are developed around the campus of both State and private schools, and this has worked extremely well.

I have spoken with the principals of all the school complexes—and that is really the only way you can describe them—and every one of them has said how well it has worked. The staff work together and share facilities and, more importantly, the children are mixing continually. It has been not only cost effective and efficient but also an extremely successful education experiment that has been undertaken in that area.

Naturally, with the development at Golden Grove, a large number of awards have been won by the Delfin group, as well as by constructors and builders within the Golden Grove area. Also, the area is blessed with community services.

As a member of Parliament, I am extremely lucky to be able to say that we have the services there. We have a recreation and arts centre, which caters for the community and the schools. For those members who have not seen the centre, I must say that it is an eye opener and well worth a look. It has won an international award. We have an international hockey/tennis complex and a swimming/fitness centre. The Golden Grove Development has really concentrated on quality throughout. The residents, I know, appreciate the services and facilities with which they have been provided.

At this stage could I pay a tribute to the Golden Grove Community Trust Fund, which has been set up to assist development in this area. The groups which should be given credit for that include the Tea Tree Gully council and the Golden Grove Development, which plays such a major role in that trust fund. They have raised millions of dollars, which has been used in all sorts of ways to assist the community in the Golden Grove Development. I stress that, although that development is a major component of the electorate of Wright, there is no way in the world, as my Labor opponent publicly stated, I have no interest in Salisbury East: nothing could be further from the truth. I can assure the residents of Salisbury East that, because of the contacts I have established

in that area, at this stage about 50 per cent of the people who have contacted me in my office for assistance or whatever come from Salisbury East, and that speaks for itself. I can assure the residents of Salisbury East that I will work for them tirelessly, just as I will for the residents of the Golden Grove Development, Surrey Downs and Fairview Park and for the people who reside in the Hills.

In addition to the Golden Grove Development we have another award winning enterprise within the electorate of Wright, that is, Air International. If members opposite have not taken the opportunity to look at the operations within the Air International set-up, they should do so, because that company can give a lesson about how management and the work force can work together to develop a marvellous working environment and production that is in the international best practice area. The success achieved by Air International is a credit to its management.

Within the electorate of Wright are two councils, the Salisbury city council and the Tea Tree Gully city council. I would like to say how much I appreciate the way in which the Salisbury city council has gone out of its way to make me feel welcome as a member working in the electorate containing a portion of that council. The mayor, the chief executive of the council, the councillors and officers have all acted in such a way that I cannot speak anything but highly of them. I place on the public record my appreciation for the way in which they have accepted me and indicated that they are looking forward to working with me. Having been a member of the Tea Tree Gully council for seven years, including two years back in the 1960s, and then for five years until I was elected as a member of Parliament, I know the staff of that council and I certainly look forward to continuing to work with them.

I now turn briefly to key elements within the Governor's speech. I emphasise how delighted I am to come back into Parliament as a member of the Liberal Government. When I was first elected in 1979 I was fortunate to be a member of the incoming Liberal Government, but this time I am certain that in four years, instead of being re-elected as a member of Parliament in Opposition, I will be back again in Government. If the *Bulletin* poll is anything to go by, we will be returned with an increased majority and I certainly look forward to that. The Liberal Party is now in a position to return the faith that the public of South Australia has shown in us in the 1993 election by proving that they certainly have not placed their faith in us without good cause.

We are starting a new era for South Australia. There will be economic and employment growth, and other points are outlined in the Governor's speech. We will create a new climate for industry. In fact, it is already here. Even members opposite would have to admit that, when we go out into the electorate, there is no doubt that the feeling is positive. Opposition members might claim, 'That is because of what we did before you took over.' I say that that is rubbish. People are looking forward to the fact that they now have a Liberal Government, a Government they are confident will assist them in building and expanding business in South Australia.

The Governor made a number of points in her speech. As to education, over many years I have been in the area of private enterprise either in marketing or human resources, but I did start the first 10 years of my career as a teacher within both the Education Department and the private school system.

My wife is and has been a teacher all her life, so I can assure the electorate that it has a member of Parliament who not only is interested in education but also has been able to

keep up with the developments in education (or otherwise as the case may be) during the past 11 years. With 22 schools in my electorate, I will certainly be devoting a large proportion of my time to that area. I thank the schools at which I have already attended morning teas with staff, school council meetings and so on, and I would like to assure them that, just as I did from 1979 to 1985, I will be developing, establishing and maintaining a very close relationship with all the State and private schools within the electorate of Wright.

Passenger transport receives a high priority in the Governor's speech. We are fortunate in the north-eastern suburbs. Again, I do not mind a little bit of bragging; I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would remember that, particularly from 1979 to 1982, I stood up many times to defend the Government's decision to introduce the O-Bahn system into South Australia. I took three trips to Germany to work and talk with Mercedes Benz, and I was absolutely convinced that that was the way to go. Between 1979 and 1982 I was pilloried many times by the members of the then Opposition for the stance I took on the O-Bahn system. Once the Opposition became the Government in 1982, it was remarkable how suddenly the O-Bahn system became the greatest thing since sliced bread.

The then Labor Government went on to complete the O-Bahn through to the Modbury interchange. I frequently use that bus service. As members would know, the Wright electorate office has not yet been prepared for me, and I come into Parliament House every day. When I do not need my car to go into the electorate I use the O-Bahn to come in here. When I talk to the constituents and the users of the O-Bahn system, I hear the praise not for any Government but for how good the O-Bahn system is. So I am delighted that, between 1979 and 1982, the now Premier (Hon. Dean Brown), the then Minister of Transport (Hon. Michael Wilson), the then member for Newland (Mr Brian Billard) and I stood so strongly for introducing the O-Bahn system into that area.

There are many other points in the Governor's speech, but as time is starting to run short I will now outline to the House the areas to which I will devote most of my time, in which I have the greatest interest and on which I will be working with the Government while I am in this House. First I refer to industrial affairs. I am sure members opposite would be very surprised if I did not have that at the top of my list, having been a group human resources manager and heavily involved in the industrial area, both on the advocacy side in the State and Federal Commissions and also in looking at strategy and working with unions on enterprise bargaining.

I am very proud to stand here and say that my most recent employer entered into two enterprise agreements and was looking to move towards another one. So, certainly industrial affairs will be very much in the area of my interest. I will also be interested in WorkCover, because I have seen at first hand the abuses to which some employees have put that system. My motion presently before the House addresses that point in greater detail. I have already mentioned education; I will certainly be spending a large amount of my time on that area. Then there is small business and, fifthly but not finally, my electorate and the people within that electorate. With respect to small business, I would like to mention again the impact this Government has already had in that area. One of the things that really knocked the stuffing out of small business was the introduction of extended trading hours.

Before the election, as I was moving around and talking to small business people within my electorate, every one of them told me how much they had lost because of extended

trading hours. I have made it my business to go back and talk to those small business people since the election, and every one of them is euphoric about the changes that have occurred under this Government. I will give just one example.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Members opposite are laughing. I refer to a delicatessen. I will not state where it is. Since the change has occurred, this small businessman's bread and milk sales have doubled, and he has also been able to take on a staff member that he previously had to put off after extended trading hours. In other words, we have additional employment. That is one case history. The mood of confidence in small business within my electorate has to be seen to be believed.

I had intended to take the opportunity at this stage to address some of the remarks of the member for Ross Smith. I am sure that he and I will cross swords on a number of occasions over the next four years because he comes from the opposite side of the points of view that I hold in many areas relating to industrial relations and WorkCover. I have had the fortune, or misfortune, of having to deal with officers and members of his union. I know, and so do employees, about the difficulties that have frequently been created for employers in many cases by interference from the union area. In his speech he referred to history back into the 1960s. However, that will have to be saved for another session when I have a grievance and can talk about it in more detail.

When I was speaking in a grievance debate earlier, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in a sort of throw-away line, referring to me, said, 'The member for whatever; I cannot remember his electorate.' I point out to the Deputy Leader that I am not surprised at that, because the electorate that I have taken over from him did not know him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): It is interesting to come into this debate after the member for Wright's remarks, some of which deserve some scrutiny. First, the member for Wright has told us about scare campaigns and a number of things that may or may not have happened in his electorate. I have no reason to dispute some of the letters that he says have gone out and I have no reason to doubt the persons who went to him and who were somewhat concerned about the issues raised. However, in the election campaign the image that the member for Wright has portrayed of its being a one-sided affair in which he and his friends were on the white horses and the rest of us were simply vilifying people like him was so much nonsense that a couple of us on this side were looking for a violin about 20 minutes ago during his speech. In his comments tonight the member for Wright made much of an opinion poll that he was waving around in the Chamber. I believe it was an A.G.B. McNair poll. Whatever the source, it is unimportant. I will let him down softly.

I am sure that the new Government is very popular right now. As I said in my speech last week, it won convincingly on 11 December. I think that process will go on for some time until it starts making decisions, because it has not been too big on that so far. In fact, I must congratulate some of the Ministers in the last week or so who have announced some decisions, because they are the first decisions that have come out.

What we have had since 11 December is one inquiry after another. Indeed, what we find is that they have not grasped government at all. The member for Unley wants to interject and make a series of comments. Let me take the member for Unley to task on this issue. Members on this side are somewhat disappointed in the member for Unley's career. He wants to interject, so we will give him what comes back on it. Of the members of 1989—

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: He does not like it, and the member for Fawcay over there, his mate, does not like it either but, at the end of the day, the member for Unley was what we thought the most likely—

Mr CAUDELL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Playford was making assertions on another member of the House, particularly in regard to me. Also, Mr Speaker, he is supposed to address each member by his electorate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. The member for Playford, in making his comments, even though he alluded in the direction of the honourable member, did not directly mention him. However, I must remind the member for Playford that he can only refer to members by their district.

Mr QUIRKE: The honourable member identified himself: I made no direct reference to that member, but I am quite happy to hold up his hand and volunteer. As I was saying, in 1989 I would have thought that the member for Unley would be voted the member most likely to succeed. He certainly moved down the benches very quickly but unfortunately—and if he wants to keep on interjecting we can go into the reasons why—he moved back just as quickly. I would say this in respect of the member for Wright—

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: As I understand it, Mr Speaker, he is one of the seven members who supported a certain leadership ticket that did not do too well around here. If he wants me to go further that is fine, but at the end of the day—and his speech last week made it fairly clear to us—the member for Unley has just not understood or grasped the problems that he has created for many members opposite. But that is not my problem; that is a problem for the Government. Getting back to the opinion poll that was waved around this Chamber, I would not be at all surprised if the new Government, in grasping, firstly, the reins of government, becomes more popular all the way up until budget time. In fact, it may be popular even beyond budget time. I do not know whether this Government will grasp the sorts of fiscal responsibilities—because I have not seen the evidence of that yet—which are required in South Australia.

However, at the end of the day, where it is concerned, the time will come when two overwhelming factors hit home. Indeed, the Liberal Party has won 37 out of 47 seats, roughly 80 per cent of the seats on about 61 per cent of the vote. The reality is that that is a record high watermark. It may well be euphoric for some members to get up and say, 'Indeed, we will do better next time,' but history does not seem to support

that conclusion. The other overwhelming reality is that redistribution is on the way. This afternoon I heard the Premier remark that the Electoral Act will be looked at. I understand that some legislation is coming in. We are waiting with bated breath to see what it is. We are wondering whether it will have the fairness principle in there: that the Party which gets 40 per cent of the vote gets 40 per cent of the seats in the House. I will make a bet that that will not be the legislation.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has consistently interjected. I do not want him to interject again.

Mr QUIRKE: In fact, the overwhelming reality is that, if the redistribution goes through, irrespective of whether we build up our votes between now and the next election—and I believe we will—not all of them will be coming back. They can have their good times now. I do not know who organised the grabbing of the big table in the dining room the other night. I am not sure who left this Chamber at quarter to six to go in there to grab what seems to be a status symbol in the dining room, but I could not care less about that.

However, I will say this: not all the 37 members who were elected to this House can feel as confident as those who were formerly sitting in much safer Liberal seats. When the redistribution comes down, I think it will cast a very big shadow on what is a very large backbench in the Liberal Party. Indeed, in a couple of years from now it will be very interesting to see—if we get opinion polls from the member for Wright being waved around the room—some of the other predictions that have been made about the fact that our numbers on this side will deplete even more. When the electoral redistribution comes down, if it involves any modicum of fairness at all, it will ensure that the 39 per cent of people who voted Labor in this State will see roughly that sort of representation in this House.

This is the argument that was raised all the time by the Liberal Party when it claimed that on 52 per cent it had at that time only 23 seats on this side of the House. I would simply say, in relation to this matter, that we are quite happy to go into the redistribution process. We believe in the necessary fairness of the system, which will place a great deal of strain on a lot of members.

It may well be that members in some areas will be very lucky with the redistribution, but luck will not run for all of them. I think those sorts of remarks need to be made in this place. They can guffaw as they do now in the dining room and the corridors; they can carry on in the way they do; and they can go around with the sort of arrogant attitude that they have. That is fine; that is all right. We have listened to it one speech after the other in the Address in Reply debate. However, we know that in a couple years from now the reality will be a very different one and there will be a lot of worried people on the Government benches.

Finally, in this respect I think one other remark needs to be made. We will look with interest to see, when this Government starts implementing some of the things that the Liberal Party really stands for, what will happen with matters such as education. I tell those members opposite who say that they are great saviours and supporters of their schools: just try to close some of them and watch what happens.

Mr TIERNAN (Torrens): I would like to bring to the attention of the House a community concern of which I was informed by Tania Brown, a resident of the electorate of Torrens. I would like to read her statement because it really

sets the scene for a major concern that we have. It is as follows:

My daughter suffered a seizure while travelling in my car. The Holden Hill police station was nearby so we took her there for immediate assistance. St John ambulance was called for by the police, and by the time they arrived my daughter had almost recovered. The ambulance crew administered oxygen and transported her to the Adelaide Women and Children's Hospital for observation. Naturally, the only concern the parents had was for the child, and they did not consider any other issue at that time. Lo and behold, several weeks later, Mrs Brown was absolutely horrified when she received a bill for \$417.30. I will read out the bill because we need to note that it says 'First and Only Ambulance Account'. There is nothing overdue; it is the actual first account, which is dated 17 January 1994. It says that the bill is for \$417.30 but that, if one is in private health insurance, one can submit the account for payment in full. If one has a Pensioner Health Benefit card the amount will be reduced by half. Otherwise, that is the bill—a bill of that nature for a basic, essential human emergency service.

When Mrs Brown approached the ambulance service as to how she could possibly pay this bill and why it was such a large and excessive amount, the answer was that the callout fee alone, no matter how far the ambulance travels, is \$392. So, she and her husband went to see what they could do about it, because their financial situation is such that, to obtain new employment, further education is required and they have to live on Austudy. They did not know what to do about it and ended up being advised to go and see the Department of Family and Community Services, who told them to approach the ambulance service again to see what could be done. They did that, and I quote the response from the ambulance service as follows:

Arrangements have been made for your account to be paid by instalments.

The account, which was the first and only account, was dated 17 January 1994, and this letter is dated 3 February 1994. There is not much of a difference, so it could not have been outstanding. The letter continues:

Failure to forward payments on the requested dates will result in the account being placed in the hands of our debt collection agency. These are people who went in and said, 'Look, we can't afford to pay this bill at once, because it is so large, just to get an ambulance to take a child to hospital, and we want to pay it as best we can.' That was agreed, and the agreement is \$50 lots until such time as the bill is paid off. It is quite a good arrangement, but the emphasis immediately was that people on Austudy, people who have financial problems in this period of recession, will automatically not pay their debts and the bill must go to a debt collector. It was a very threatening and intimidating letter to the person concerned.

Remember that these people have limited finance, and to add insult to injury there was a \$20 accounting fee to help them pay the bill. In other words, to add to their woes, the bill was increased by \$20. This is just for handling it, not because they are late. Then, of course, they also get the threatening insinuation that, if it is late at any time, the collection agency Harrison and Associates will be handling the matter. Not a very positive or nice way to treat people who really were diligent about paying their bill and who certainly were very upset to have it assumed they would be negligent in paying it. There are some problems there, about which I would like to speak.

The whole episode raises considerable concerns, the first being the attitude of the ambulance service towards those who have genuinely limited finance. It is difficult to under-

stand this attitude: the immediate assumption that people on Austudy will not pay their bill and in the first instance threatening to use a debt collector; then, to add insult to injury, to add an extra \$20 to a bill they are having difficulty in paying. It is punishing those who are already having financial difficulties. What a system we have at the moment. There must be something wrong. What sort of a system is it that punishes people because they are suffering from the recession?

The community as a whole must ask why. Why does it cost so much for essential, basic human services? Why is it so much just for a callout fee that is almost four times that of a plumber—and they are recognised as being expensive enough? And it is not just the callout fee. When I asked this question I was informed that our ambulance service is now operated by the union movement, which operates a closed shop without any assistance from volunteers. I am not sure that this is so: I am really not sure of the situation. But regardless of whether or not it is true, the community must ask the question: why are members of our community denied the opportunity to assist voluntarily in their own community emergency services?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TIERNAN: I appreciate what you are saying, but do not misunderstand me: I do not subscribe to volunteers replacing full-time paid staff, or full-time paid jobs. We have enough unemployment; we do not need to create any more. But surely in this enlightened society, full paid staff and volunteers could work together to address the issues and the concerns. Together they could increase the ambulance service, which has constantly been highlighted as under stress

and strain when they cannot adequately cover the whole area. So, why cannot full time staff and volunteers increase the ambulance service, reduce the ridiculous cost to our emergency service, and also allow people the opportunity to contribute to our community? By allowing them to be part of the community and contribute towards it, particularly in emergency services, it will help to develop a caring and harmonious society.

In conclusion, the community and its leaders, including the Government, must debate the issues and ask the following questions: Why does a basic human emergency service cost so much money? Why do the administrators of that service seem to add further financial punishment to those that have limited finance by adding an extra burden for time payment? Is the union controlling the ambulance service operating a closed shop? Should we deny our people the noble opportunity to serve their community in an obvious emergency human service? I could go on for ages about this particular concern, but I put it to all members that we should look at these concerns.

I wish to officially record the excellent service provided by the officers of those ambulances. I must congratulate them on their dedication and highly skilled operation, undertaken at considerable personal risk of disease in today's society; they do excellent work. In no way are my concerns to be taken as a criticism of their service. It is a major community concern. I know of five people who have come into my office in recent weeks and who have been horrified when, after an emergency, they have received this account.

Motion carried.

At 10.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 23 February at 2 p.m.